THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXVII JULY, 1938 No. 217

EDITORIAL

A just-published volume of *Cambridge Sermons*, by Sir Edwyn Clement Hoskyns (S.P.C.K., 6s.), deserves to be read with attention. There are in existence many volumes of good modern sermons, but few so thoroughly stamped with the impress of a powerful and consistent mind. The distinctive theology of the preacher is apparent all the time. Hoskyns was a teacher, an interpreter of both the Catholic Faith and the Bible. These are Catholic sermons, but they are above all Bible sermons. Mr. Smyth, in his extremely interesting introduction, part of which has appeared in our columns, quotes an instructive appreciation from Mr. J. O. Cobham:

> "Hoskyns was never a Barthian. That, I am sure, wants saying. But at the time when his own work on the New Testament was forcing him away from Catholic Modernism he discovered Barth as someone who supplied him with a language through which to express what he himself was discovering from the New Testament. And the Barth he appreciated was the Barth of the *Romerbrief*, not the Barth of the *Dogmatik*."

This is no doubt very just. Yet there is hardly a page of the sermons which does not help us to understand why he was commonly thought of as a Barthian. One such page is this:

> "It is a hard truth for us to learn, we in the pride of our achievements, we with our doctrines of evolution, we with our petty impertinence convinced that God can only speak to men through men, through human personalities. If we are to become Christians we must learn to see through all this modern make-believe, and return to the old Christian language of the Advent of God. The Church, the Bible, the bread and wine of the Eucharist,

> in fact the Christ, there, if we have eyes to see it, is the active creative Word of God, there at the point at which the other world, the power of the omnipotent God, touches this world. The Kingdom of God upon earth, the eschatology, the end of history, the remission of sin."

The Christian case against Pelagianism could hardly be put more strongly.

One of the chief merits of the book is that it supplies an answer to a question often asked, and perhaps still more often felt in silence, at the end of a course of lectures to clergy. The question is: How can we by our preaching pass on to an average congregation the sort of theology which has been put before us in these lectures? Here are many illustrations of how it can be done. Eschatology, the peculiarities of the New Testament vocabulary, the Markan document, Q, are all used, learnedly and yet lucidly, to strengthen and confirm the faith of hearers. The preacher has no confidence in modern nostrums, nor in those substitutions of something other and smaller than the Gospel for the Gospel itself which are so popular. He does not shrink from calling attention to the essential and inevitable strangeness of the Gospel. Unflinchingly, and with a large range, he proclaims the strange, satisfying Gospel. A sentence from one of the sermons—

> " This is ultimately the meaning of the whole Bible, and it is the Gospel of the Church "—

might have occurred in almost any.

A little book by Father Hebert and Father Allenby, *Pray with the Church* (S.P.C.K., 1s. 6d.), has a like purpose. It consists of Notes on the Collects, Epistles and Gospels for Sundays and Holy Days. Its watchword is " Bible and Church." The Introduction says that—

> " we only really know the Bible when we grasp the fact that it is the book of the Christian community, the Church. . . . It is from our experience of life in the Church that we come to understand what the Bible is talking about; also, it is only from the Bible that we come to understand the true meaning of our life in the Church."

The principles which govern *Liturgy and Society*, and indeed the whole Liturgical Movement, are behind this book. The share of the people in the Eucharist, especially at the Offertory, is emphasized, and it is said that " when the service is over, the Church is dismissed from serving God in His Temple to

serve Him in the world." The Notes are intended to be used either for a service of preparation or privately. There is much more stuff in them than in the contents of many far more ambitious and expensive volumes.

Another little book, *An Alternative Order of Holy Communion*, by R. D. R. (Jas. Clarke, 4d.), emanates from another quarter and has a rather different motive. If it could be thought of only as a suggestion towards revision, it would be interesting and useful, though most of the suggestions would need, after consideration, to be rejected. Given the intention to eliminate from the Liturgy everything that is distasteful to the modernist intelligentsia, the purpose is efficiently and on the whole kindly carried out. Some valuable additions are made, and at first sight a good deal of what is traditional seems to remain. But on examination it proves that the Creed has gone, " Do this " has gone, and the Proper Prefaces are all expurgated. It thus fails to represent historic Christianity in the way in which at Holy Communion, the historic service of Christianity, the Liturgy must do. The general idea of using the Beatitudes as part of a devotion, or of asking worshippers to pledge themselves in the language of a revised Creed which catches and enlists attention, is excellent, and might well be followed on private occasions. But as a Liturgy the pamphlet will not do. It is a result of theological private judgment, and that of a rather unusual, not generally acceptable, kind. Those whose judgment it is would describe it as the theology of the future. Others would say that it is still bound in the trammels of nineteenth-century Liberalism. At all events, it is not the *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*, nor is it the voice of the Church today. A rather astonishing claim is made in the Introduction that the use of it is in essence faithful to the Declaration of Assent made by Anglican clergymen, in that " Anglican theology moves along certain definite and distinctive lines which distinguish it from Romanism on the one hand and the extremer forms of Protestantism on the other."

This may well be true of Anglican theological thinking, writing and preaching, but we do not understand how it can be thought to provide a justification for a service like this. The performance of the Liturgy is essentially the Act of the Church, and the element of private judgment must there be reduced to a minimum.

This matter of private judgment is not easy. It sometimes seems that there is a great division among Christian theologians, and that some believe on authority alone, and that others, as

one of the complete authoritarians once said, "for the ridiculous reason that they happen to think that it is true." We suspect, though we have no inside knowledge of the method of this school of thought, that the authoritarians are not so merely authoritarian as they suppose. And we are sure that many of those who are accused of trusting in the arm of the flesh are not destitute of the panoply of faith. Experience is a word at which the authoritarian shudders. Why? Because he assumes that it only means "What I feel myself." But experience, rightly understood, means what the Catholic Church has experienced and is experiencing. (We apologize for truckling to the base fashion of turning a noun into a verb. It is unavoidable. The verb "to exper" does not exist, and any other would have a different shade of meaning.) The argument from Catholic experience not only includes the Creed; it begins with the Creed.

The argument from experience needs to be handled in this large way. It is true that there is, within the great Christian experience, the smaller Anglican experience, and the way in which it teaches us to interpret the general truth is seen in the Prayer Book. But this, except in so far as it consists of introducing us to the total Faith, by inserting, for example, the Nicene Creed into the prescribed Liturgy, is devotional. Our Anglicanism gives us English prayers and English Psalms and English lections. The tendency to construct an Anglican orthodoxy needs to be carefully watched. And the tendency to regard such Anglican orthodoxy as binding needs to be watched even more carefully. On this rock the proposal made lately in the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation to revise the Thirty-nine Articles makes shipwreck.

The proposal is at first sight attractive. The articles are a sixteenth-century manifesto. They "date" badly. They are concerned with a number of things which do not now seem important. They make some hundreds of affirmations on mysterious and controversial subjects. The form of assent was in 1865 deliberately made general, but, even so, the older clergy, broadly speaking, have assented to Gibson, and the younger to Bicknell. Unsatisfactory, it will be said. Let us then revise them. We notice that a correspondent of *The Times* and the writer of a leading article in the *Spectator* applaud the suggestion. It seems to some that the present moment is propitious. Let us revise the Articles, says the Dean of St. Paul's in Convocation, in the light of the Doctrinal Report. It would be a most interesting task. But remember that the

revised form would then be proposed as an instrument binding on the minds and consciences of the clergy. The Thirty-nine Articles happen to be very ambiguous. They were " articles of peace," designed to exclude Mediævalists and Anabaptists, and to include, if possible, everybody else. Could any company of modern theologians deliberately set themselves to frame an ambiguous statement ? To have inherited such a statement from the past is one thing, to repeat the device is another. And do we want to create any fresh obligation at all ?

Much the best thing to do with the Articles would be to get rid of them altogether. The elaborate doctrinal statement, to which occasional recourse is made as a guarantee of orthodoxy, is almost wholly useless. It is worse than the petitions which strew our ecclesiastical history, because the petitions only last nine days, and the Articles have lasted since 1571, though they had a jolt in 1865. The only serviceable test of orthodoxy is a document beginning with the words " I believe," which is habitually and publicly recited. That is the real *tessera.* And inasmuch as it happens that the existing documents of that nature are in fact the documents of the whole Church, they are in every way superior to the document of local origin and temporary interest which was never intended for more than very occasional use. Moreover, the dismissal of the Articles to the *emeriti* class would help to roll away a reproach. An intelligent priest is very sensitive about his intellectual honesty. He believes that he can assent to the Articles without insincerity. But he knows that most people believe him to be insincere in his assent to them. He does not mind at all being thought a fool for believing in the Cross of Christ, or anything else for which he really cares. But, with so many real and necessary causes of offence which he must endure, and endures gladly, he finds it hard that he should have to support as well this unnecessary and distasteful, though not quite intolerable, burden. It is like bracing yourself to be a Christian martyr, and then finding that you are only being laughed at as a Victorian or as a person without a sense of humour. It is like offering your body to be burned in the market-place, and then being tapped on the shoulder by a policeman for obstructing the traffic.

FATHER AUGUSTINE BAKER AND THE SOURCES OF *SANCTA SOPHIA*

I

On December 9, 1575, David Baker was born in Abergavenny. His father was steward to Lord Abergavenny and his mother a daughter of the local vicar. Both were pious people, and, though not owning allegiance to the Holy See, were not actively hostile and anti-papalist. After some home tuition David went to Christ's Hospital, and in 1590 entered Broadgate's Hall, Oxford. His two years at the University were not very advantageous to him, because, in spite of "some progress in secular learning," he was enticed by a few youthful and irreligious companions into a life of frivolity, which resulted in his abandonment of the duties of religion. In 1592 he was summoned home by his father, even though he had not then completed the prescribed course of study. It is very probable that this sudden command was issued because some details of his manner of life at Oxford had reached his home-town and upset his parents, and his father's subsequent plans for his son's marriage and ecclesiastical career suggest that he was desirous of settling his son down to an ordinary and assured way of life. However, the plans were distasteful to David, possibly at this time the young lady in question was even more unacceptable to him than the Church, and as a result he became apprenticed as a law-student to his brother Richard.

In 1596 David moved to London and became a member of Lincoln's Inn and later of the Inner Temple. The habit of life which he had learned and adopted at Oxford was still his, and he would seem to have had no respect for, or faith in, the Christian religion as interpreted either by Rome or Canterbury. Dom Cressy regards him at this period as being almost an atheist in theory and certainly in practice, though this is not to suggest that he was living a morally profligate life. When his brother died, David returned to Abergavenny to help his father administer the local lord's estate, and in due course became Recorder of the town. In this new capacity much legal work of a minor nature fell to him, and court attendances took him to various parts in the vicinity. On one journey he was riding his horse, and being engrossed in thinking did not perceive his imminent danger until the trembling, neighing and snorting of his horse aroused him to a realization of his predicament.

Instead of crossing a certain "impetuous river" by the customary ford, David's mount had followed "a narrow beaten track which at last brought him to the middle of a wooden footbridge large enough at the first entrance, but growing still more and more narrow and of an extraordinary height above the water." It was impossible to proceed forward or to return backwards, and as David could not swim it was sheer folly to risk jumping into the waters below. In his awful plight he vowed that if he were delivered he would believe in God, His care and love. Suddenly he found himself on *terra firma* and in safety, and though he did not understand how such came about, he knew that it was miraculous and an act of God. The sequel was David's resolution not only to believe in God's Providence, but also in some true way to serve Him.

David now began to read with a new interest religious and historical books, and there can be no doubt that he paid considerable attention to the present state of religion in England, and so was forced to examine the principles and conditions of the Henrician Reformation. The result of his enquiry was that he returned to Christ's religion, not as his parents practised it, but as their parents had practised it. Shortly afterwards he went under instruction from the Reverend Richard Floyd, who, as a missionary priest, secretly tended the needs of his papalist confrères in the neighbourhood, and through him was received into the Roman branch of the Catholic Church, to which he resolved to dedicate himself in the Religious Life. With the purpose of testing his vocation, David went to London, and there came into contact with some English monks of the Italian Benedictine Congregation of Monte Cassino, usually known as the Cassinese Congregation, and as a result of their influence he entered the Benedictine novitiate in Italy. On May 27, 1605, he was clothed as a novice son of St. Benedict in the Abbey of St. Justina at Padua. In Italy he had a serious illness, and before taking his vows was allowed to return to England, where he heard of his own father's illness. He speedily went to Wales, brought his father to submission to the Roman Catholic Church, and then returned to London, where he made his religious profession at the age of thirty-two, being henceforth known as Dom Augustine Baker, monk of Westminster. The position of Westminster as a Benedictine Abbey at this time is most interesting. Before the English fathers of the Cassinese Congregation came back to their homeland in 1603, they learned that there was one surviving monk of the original congregation at Westminster, Dom Sigebert Buckley by name, and by rule of canon law the rights and privileges of the Abbey were now vested in him. Accordingly it was decided to perpetuate the

Benedictine life in connection with the Abbey, and so it fell to Dom Buckley to profess certain monks as monks of Westminster, and among these was Augustine Baker, who was professed in 1607.

From 1608 to 1619 Father Baker was in London performing some priestly duties and also practising the law. It was towards the end of this period that he read the mystical classic entitled *Speculum Perfectionis*, which deeply impressed him and made him realize that he had not acted correctly at the time of his conversion. In 1619 he was ordained priest at Rheims, and then his superiors appointed him chaplain to Mr. Philip Fursden in Devonshire. This west country house was one of the homes for Roman Catholics and a refuge for missionary priests from the Continent who were determined to reinstate the pre-Reformation papal régime. Here Father Baker found an unmolested peace and limitless opportunity for devoting himself to the exercises of pure spirituality, but unfortunately his health again became bad and he was compelled to return to London. His superiors thought that, in view of his consumptive symptoms, he should lead a more energetic life, and so new work, mainly of a literary character, was given to him. He now gathered much material for Dom Clement Reyner, who was compiling his massive work *Apostolatus Benedictinorum in Anglia*, and he was in touch with such scholars as Sir Henry Spelman, Sir Robert Cotton and Camden the antiquary. He was also engaged in writing some spiritual treatises.

In 1624 he went to stay at the monastery of St. Gregory at Douai. This monastery had been founded in 1607 by English members of the Spanish Congregation, and it remained closely in touch with this country and was the central refuge for the exiled Roman priests from England. Its school was justly famous, and thither many Roman Catholic families sent their sons for education. As is well known the monastery and school moved in 1814 to its present perfect home at Downside. After a few weeks in Douai Father Baker came to Cambrai, where in 1623 Father Rudesind Barlow had founded a congregation of Benedictine nuns. For some nine years Father Baker acted as spiritual director and adviser to these nuns, and also devoted much time to the writing of his mystical treatises. In the capacity of spiritual director Father Baker had found his true niche, and his masterly teaching was much appreciated and extensively productive of results. Among those nuns who came into intimate contact with him were Catherine Gascoigne and Gertrude More. The former lived to a very old age, and after assisting in the foundation of the Benedictine convent at Cambrai in 1623 became its abbess. Gertrude More was one of

the original nuns at Cambrai, and, as well befitted a descendant of the martyr St. Thomas More, rose to great heights of devotion. At first she was not inclined to follow Father Baker's directorship, but a passage written by him on aridity in devotion so fitted her temporary state that she became convinced of his spiritual value as a guide, and in the Lord both became great friends. She died in 1633 at the young age of twenty-seven, and has left behind a little religious study called by her *An Idiot's Devotion*, but wisely renamed by Father Baker *Confessiones Amantis*.

In 1633 Father Baker was moved back to St. Gregory's at Douai, and five years later he came to London* and spent the rest of his life in lodgings in Holborn and Bedfordshire. At this particular period there was a lull in active opposition to the Roman Catholics in England, and "the years 1638-9 seem to have been the peak period of prosperity and established quiet which the Catholics would not experience again until two centuries later. It was a time of security very different from the abrupt swing of the pendulum in the reign of James II. Sharing in the good returns which the landed gentry then received, the recusants were able to offset in some measure the heavy damages of the fines. Secessions among the wealthier classes ceased; the strain under which the Catholic body laboured had lifted."† However, the lull from persecution was only temporary, and in 1641 there was a fresh outburst against the missionary Roman priests. Among the martyrs of the Caroline period were the Benedictines Dom Ambrose Barlow and Dom Alban Rose, Father Thomas Holland, S.J., and Fathers William Ward, Hugh Green, Edward Catherick, Thomas Reynolds and John Lockwood, all of whom were beatified in 1929. Dom Barlow and Dom Rose were personal friends of Father Baker, and had not an infectious fever attacked him it is probable that he would have added another to the number of these Caroline martyrs. As it was he was compelled to reside in secret, and a mother of a nun at Cambrai, Dame Mary Watson, tended him with maternal solicitude. For four days he was desperately ill, and most of the time unconscious. Before his death on St. Lawrence's Eve, 1641, he made acts of perfect resignation and total submission to the good will and pleasure of Almighty God.‡ An English Benedictine book by Dom Thomas Woodhope, and now deposited in the Bodleian, has

* *Sancta Sophia*, Treatise I., Sec. iii., chap. x., gives wise advice to those who are summoned by their superiors to return to England as missionary priests, and the whole chapter is worthy of careful reading.

† David Mathew, *Catholicism in England*, 1535-1935, p. 81.

‡ *Sancta Sophia*, Treatise III., Sec. iii., chap. v., gives details of religious conduct in the hour of death.

this note: "1641, August 9, Obiit pater Augustinus Baker, Dei Custodiæ in Lotharingia professus, infirma valetudine, sed vita regulari, devotissimisque scriptis suis nusquam non memorandus. Eius animæ proprietur Deus."

II

In 1605 Hugh Paulin was born at Wakefield, and the date of his birth coincided with that of Father's Baker clothing as a Benedictine in Padua. He was educated at Oxford, and at the age of his majority became a Fellow of Merton. He was ordained into the Anglican Church, and was in turn chaplain to Lord Wentworth and Lord Falkland. Then he became a canon of Windsor and the Irish dean of Leighlin. Later he was one of the converts to Rome from Laudian Anglicanism. Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, and Dr. Thomas Bayly of Wells were among the well-known people who also moved to the obedience of Rome. In 1647 the former Irish dean wrote his *Exomologesis*, in which he gave reasons for his secession to the Papal See, and this work was dedicated to the Carthusian Fathers of Nieuport. April, 1649, saw Hugh Paulin enter the Benedictine Community at Douai, and henceforth he was known as Father Serenus Cressy. After eight years as a monk at Douai and Paris he was sent as a missionary priest to Southern England. In 1662 Charles II. married Catherine of Braganza, the Roman Catholic princess of Portugal, and she was permitted to have her own chaplains in England, and accordingly six monks, including Father Cressy, went into residence with or near her and received the sum of one hundred pounds per annum. For four years Father Cressy resided at Somerset House, and devoted his time to pastoral ministration and to writing, particularly to the writing of his very useful *Church History of Brittany*. He ended his life's work as chaplain to Richard Caryl of East Grinstead, and died in August, 1674.

There is no reason for supposing that Father Cressy ever met Father Baker; his conversion to Roman Catholicism did not occur until five years after Father Baker's death. In the monastery of St. Gregory at Douai he was daily walking along passages and paths where Father Baker had trod, and there can be no doubt that at this time the value of his illustrious predecessor was fully appreciated by his co-religionists, of whom some must have had intimate knowledge and contact with Father Baker. Shortly before he travelled to England, Father Serenus was asked by Father Lawrence Reyner to collect and arrange the numerous manuscripts of spiritual writing which Father Baker had prepared for the instruction of the

"Dames" committed to his charge at Cambrai. After having "methodically digested" these writings, Father Cressy published some of them in 1657 under the title *Sancta Sophia*, and, as he says in his prefatory letter to Father Reyner, "the pains herein taken will appear to be not very ordinary to any one that shall consider how difficult a matter it is out of such a world of treatises (written upon particular subjects for the special necessities and use of certain devout persons, without an eye or design in the author of affording materials for an entire body of spirituality) to frame such a body not at all defective, and with parts not unproportionable." But, though the compilation was a serious labour, it was, as Father Serenus admits, a labour of love and gratitude, because Father Baker's influence had led him both towards his reconciliation with the Church of Rome and his membership of the Order of St. Benedict.

III

Sancta Sophia is a skilful collection of spiritual writings which have been extracted from more than forty treatises written by Father Baker, and it is a very able and penetrating instruction in the prayer of contemplation and the way of holy living. It is written for those who have made some advance in the spiritual life, and therefore is peculiarly suitable for priests and religious. It is a compilation of teaching originally given to devout dames of the Benedictine Order, and it is not that type of mysticism without tears which St. Francis de Sales about the same time so fascinatingly wrote for every man and woman. *Sancta Sophia* always moves slowly along an exalted way, and each step is made with the maximum of care and nothing is left unexplained. There are no flashes of illuminating humour, such as one finds in William Law's works, and all the time the reader is conscious of being in the guiding hands of a supreme master and vivid thinker who speaks only of what he knows by experience and revelation. "The style is involved, and yet is not cumbrous. There is a certain exactness, as it were of legalism, which affects the language with an obvious restraint. But, on the other hand, there are felicities of thought, and, more rarely, of expression, which give the book a definite place in the literature of devotion."*

An interesting enquiry offers itself in an attempt to discover the sources from which Father Baker gathered much of his theoretical knowledge of the spiritual life. In making such an

* Dr. W. H. Hutton in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. vi., p. 143.

enquiry the first fact to be realized is that he himself was a mystic who had been privileged by the Divine Generosity to have the grace of infused contemplation. He lays down three golden qualifications for an expert director of souls*—namely, a good natural judgment, learning and experience—and there is every proof that he himself was a most astute critic, a most exact—almost to the degree of being tedious—scholar and a most faithful theorizer of that which he had known by personal practice in his own spiritual life.

As has been observed, the book which first seriously helped Father Baker during the time of his conversion was *Speculum Perfectionis*, a fourteenth-century work written by the English mystic Walter Hylton. Its author did not profess to have experienced much of what he so clearly describes. "But God knows that I am teaching far more than I practise." Nevertheless, the reader feels that it is noble humility which prevents Hylton from claiming for himself much advance in the spiritual life. Only a life of devotion can make a great book of devotion, and such is true of reader or writer. The *Speculum Perfectionis* is indeed a great book—"the *Scale of Perfection* only needs to be known, in order to take high rank among the best specimens of devotional literature."†

Another English contemplative work known to be appreciated and used by Father Baker is *The Cloud of Unknowing*, which also belongs to the fourteenth century and is written in the Midland dialect by an undiscoverable author. This book, with its emphasis on Light and Darkness, is throughout profoundly indebted to the mother-work of all Catholic mystical writings—namely, the sixth-century works of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, especially to his *On the Divine Names* and *Mystical Theology*. That Father Baker also knew both these pseudonymous writings is proved by quotations in *Sancta Sophia*—viz., Treatise I., Sec. ii., chap. vii., 15; Treatise III., Sec. i., chap. vii., 13 and 18.

Other books recommended by Father Baker for contemplative reading are *The Secret Paths of Divine Love*, by the Capuchin R. F. Constantin Barbanson, and the rather unfamiliar *Of the Threefold Will of God*, by R. F. Benet Fink.‡ The value of St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross is seen not

* *Sancta Sophia*, Treatise I., Sec. ii., chap. ii., 3.

† W. R. Inge, *Studies of English Mystics*, p. 82.

‡ Father Benet Fink, Filch or Fitch, b. 1563 at Camfield, became a Capuchin in 1586 after seceding to the Roman Church. He was a missionary priest to England, and when arrested was released at the request of Henry IV. Bremond regards him as the "master of masters themselves" in connection with his influence on the renaissance of French mysticism. *Cf. A Literary History of Religious Thought in France*, vol. ii., pp. 111 *ff.* (S.P.C.K.). Father Baker's copy of *The Cloud of Unknowing* belonged to Father Benet's library.

only in his commendation of their writings, but in *Sancta Sophia* having eleven direct references to the former and seven to the latter. That St. Teresa's *Life* exercised a most powerful influence on Father Baker is most obvious from his numerous agreements with her of whom he speaks as an "eminent saint." Though there may be details of divergence, in the main Father Baker's teaching about the higher art of prayer is truly Teresian.

From early authors Father Baker selects *Lives of the Ancient Fathers living in the Desert*, St. Basil's *Rule*, and Cassian's *Conferences of Certain Ancient Hermits*, which St. Benedict had particularly advised his followers to study. It is interesting to note that no mention is made by Father Baker of St. Benedict's *Rule*, though in the *Sancta Sophia* there are thirteen direct references to its teaching, and among his papers is an "Exercise of Devotion towards our Holy Father and Religious Founder, St. Benedict."

That Father Baker was much indebted to the German school of philosophical mystics is self-evident. This school has as its founder and inspirer Meister Eckhart (1260-1327), who is not extravagantly known as the "German Plotinus." He was a Dominican who towards the end of his life had the accusation of heresy brought against him by the Archbishop of Cologne, and in 1329 a Papal Bull condemned seventeen heretical and eleven dangerous doctrines in his mystical writings. His famous followers included John Tauler and Blessed Henry Suso. The former was also a Dominican, and his *Sermons* are perhaps the best example of German spiritual teaching in any age. Suso (1295-1365) influenced mystical writing through his *Horologium Sapientiæ*, which came to be regarded almost as a perfect textbook of mediæval meditation, and is infinitely superior to his popularly known *Autobiography*. Though a Fleming, Blessed John of Ruysbroeck (1293-1381), surnamed *Doctor Extaticus*, rightly is claimed as a son of Eckhart, because of his contact with the German school and in particular with Tauler.

It is impossible accurately to assess Father Baker's indebtedness to these four philosophical mystics, but the debt is plainly real. Though not a philosopher in the sense of Eckhart, Father Baker is not an anti-rationalist who cannot acknowledge the nobility of reason.* If a classification must be made for him, he is to be numbered among the Cistercians and St. Bernard, the Victorines and St. Hugh and St. Richard, the Franciscans and St. Bonaventure, who, without scorning intellectualism,

* *Cf. Sancta Sophia*, Treatise I., Sec. ii., chap. vii.

enthroned the affective life as that most near to God and His wisdom. His legalist mind would not allow philosophy to become a mere battle of words, profitless and waste of time, and so he found in the German school of mysticism a real help and valuable clarification. From Blessed Henry Suso it is most probable that he learned, among other matters, as he did also from other writers, the meaning and importance of interior and exterior mortification, to which he devotes the whole of his second treatise, *Of the First Instrument of Perfection*—viz., *Mortification*. Suso will always be remembered as the arch-mortificator.

The works of John Gersen and Louis de Blois must not be forgotten in an attempt to trace the sources of Father Baker's writings. Gersen (1363-1429) was a disciple of Peter d'Ailly at the College of Navarre and his successor as chancellor of the University of Paris. His ascetical and mystical works are of extreme value and have deeply influenced many subsequent writers. Father Faber goes so far as to call him "the St. Thomas of modern spirituality."* His most widely read books have always been *De Monte Contemplationis*, *De Theologica Mystica Speculativa et Practica*, and *De Elucidatione Scholastica Mysticæ Theologiæ*. If a brief and inadequate comment can be made about his mystical writings, it is that he was sensitive to the dangers of certain exaggerated statements made by mystical writers, which suggested, if they did not altogether claim, that the mystical way led not only to God, but to deification. When Schwester Katrei, the spiritual daughter of Eckhart and an object of veneration among the Beguines, exclaims, "Congratulate me, I have become God!" or when John of Ruysbroeck says that "all men who are exalted above their creatureliness into a contemplative life are one with this Divine glory, yea, are that glory," one can understand why Gersen postulated that the mystical way led not to actual union with, or absorption in, God, but to an intimate moral union of love with Love. It is in the last chapters of the *Sancta Sophia* that Father Baker deals with the subject of union, and he writes carefully and moderately as would be expected of one who had read and understood Gersen.

Blosius or Louis de Blois (1506-1566), Abbot of Liesse, is one of the shining lights among the Benedictine Order, which has produced numerous scholars and saints. He was brought up in the court of Charles V., and to him is due the reformation of Benedictine and monastic life throughout Belgium. His most important contribution to the way of perfection, apart

* *Growth in Holiness*, chap. xvii.

from the shining evidence of his own life, is his *Institutio Spiritualis* (1551), and there is good reason to believe that this work had a most deep influence on Father Baker, as some of its teaching on the Virtues and Self-renunciation is similar to certain passages in *Sancta Sophia*. Certainly it is mainly from Blosius and the Benedictine tradition that Father Baker has learned his incomparable use of the Second Degree of Internal Prayer—namely, the exercises of immediate and spontaneous acts of the will and ejaculations. From the *Institutio Spiritualis* he had "A Daily Constant Exercise," which he called "a peculiar exercise, consisting of all variety of affections and acts of the will." This Exercise consists of Acts of Contrition, Reflections on the Merits and Passion of our Saviour, Acts of Self-abnegation, Pleas to the Blessed Virgin, Petitions to our Lord for Virtues, Prayers for the Church, Adoration of the Most Blessed Trinity and Aspirations of Love to God.

Apart from *Sancta Sophia* Father Baker's writings are only known to the Benedictines, some mystics and a few scholars. It is for this reason that a brief mention must be made of his *Secretum, sive Mysticum*, the first part of which is dated as being written on December 1, 1629. As has previously been mentioned, at this time he was director at Cambrai to the nuns of the convent of our Lady of Consolation. The *Secretum* is a commentary on *The Cloud of Unknowing*, and probably the occasion of its writing was that his nuns read *The Cloud*, and he was anxious that they should understand clearly its high spirituality. It is true that he only uses a sixteenth-century recension of this work and regards the book as being written "about the year of our Lord, 1500," whereas investigation definitely suggests the proper date as being *circa* 1350. He calls the book "an excellent book," but does not fail to face up to the difficulty of its interpretation, even for those advanced in the spiritual life. He mentions other writers who have made some attempt to explain the teaching of *The Cloud*, such as Alphonsus Madriliensis, a Franciscan; Father Benet Fink in *Of the Threefold Will of God*, Book III.; and Constantin de Barbanson (1582-1631) in *Secrets Sentiers de l'Amour Divin*.

The *Secretum* is in part autobiographical, and in 1922 Dom Justin McCann, monk of Ampleforth, very cleverly collected the passages relating to Father Baker's own spiritual life in the first part of the *Secretum*, with some paragraphs from the second part, and published them under the title of *The Confessions of Venerable Father Augustine Baker*. That part of the *Secretum* which is a running commentary on *The Cloud* is most valuable.

"There seems, indeed, to remain even naturally in all

souls a certain propension to seek God,"* and the right and best way by which this seeking can terminate in the success of finding is so well portrayed by Father Baker that it would be folly to deprive oneself of so invaluable a guide and teacher as the author of *Sancta Sophia.*

PATRICK COWLEY.

IS OUR CHRISTOLOGY ORTHODOX?

(A PAPER READ OCTOBER, 1936, BEFORE THE MANCHESTER CONCORD.)

LAST year I read a paper in which I tried to express my understanding of the doctrine of the Holy and Undivided Trinity. This paper, with some additions and modifications suggested by our discussion of the paper, was published in THEOLOGY last December. I sent a copy to the late Mr. Tremenheere, who was kind enough to make some observations upon it. Something that he said has led to my wish to write this second paper.

Before, however, approaching my proper subject I should say that remarks of a kindly critic have led me to wish in one respect to amend one of my previous contentions. He insisted that whenever Christian thinkers have in pursuit of some logically rigid dogma attempted to cut themselves off from the Hebrew background of our faith the mind of the Catholic Church has rejected such logic. Marcion travelled outside orthodoxy when he repudiated the Old Testament and re-wrote the New Testament so as to exclude any previous Hebrew ideas. With this in mind I would now pause before requiring our creeds or liturgies to re-write expressions which derive from the traditional language of Jewish Christians, although I still feel that such older language very often confuses the thought of the uninstructed. It may very well be that the Eastern fathers are right, as Westcott thought, in declaring that within the eternal essence of the Trinity there are distinctions not inadequately adumbrated by the language used by the New Testament writers. In my paper I allowed that this might be so but preferred to dwell upon the incapacity of human thought to pronounce on the mystery of the Divine Nature, and I should still prefer to adhere to that modest submission, but, warned

* *Sancta Sophia,* Treatise I., Sec. i., chap. ii.

by the Marcionite error, I will concede that I may be wrong in not accepting at once the doctrine of the East.

This caveat uttered, I come to Mr. Tremenheere's criticism. He did not find in what I had written any clear expression of what he suspected, although I will admit that his instinct was right in feeling that my thought had travelled along the same lines as Canon Hodgson, whom he mentioned, and one or two others. He would have it that these writers had unconsciously accepted a position which could properly be regarded as Nestorian, and he argued that the New Testament writers made statements which he at any rate found irreconcilable with the Nestorian position. For myself I had for many years expressed the doctrine of the Incarnation in such a way as to say that God the Son in pursuance of the Divine purpose confined and circumscribed Himself for a while within the limits of human nature. I have at times tried to illustrate my conception of this Kenosis by recalling how we can ourselves concentrate our attention and our consciousness upon some occupation while leaving a sort of wider external consciousness dimly observing other events. For instance, I have said, a public speaker may be concentrating the main power of his consciousness upon his speech or argument and yet he may be aware that a late comer has just entered the building at the far end, that someone in the front row squints, and that someone on his right side has just sneezed. In the same way I have suggested that the Second Person of the Trinity narrowed his consciousness within the range of human consciousness and yet remained divinely conscious of his sustaining activity of all creation. A theologian, however, habituated to the conclusions of modern psychology, has denied that such a representation as this of the manner of the Incarnation could be accepted because he said that it was well known that concentration of consciousness upon one subject intensified the consciousness, and if the infinite consciousness of Deity were concentrated upon the narrow field of observation possible to humanity, it would cause it to be thus intensified, to become super-infinite—an inference which, he said, reduced to an absurdity my attempt to express the doctrine. When I first heard this criticism I was at a loss how to deal with it, although, since my illustration was only intended as an illustration which might suggest faintly the truth and the manner of the Incarnation, I could not see any necessary flaw in my argument or presentation of the doctrine. It has since occurred to me to raise a question on which I should be glad to have the opinions of my brethren. Does the psychologist's argument assume for the Deity an infinity of consciousness in a sense in which infinity cannot truly be postulated? I have frequently

found it necessary to insist that God is not omnipotent in the sense in which the assertion of His omnipotence is often made, but that He is Almighty. It is not that He can do anything and everything; it is that His sway, His controlling and overmastering sovereignty, extends to everything and everybody in His universe. Bishop Pearson pointed out clearly enough 250 years ago that there are things which God cannot do. He cannot, said the Bishop, lie nor make the past undone; in other words, He is Almighty in a sense which accepts the faith that He can only do things which are consonant with His character.

If omnipotence is to be defined in terms not of mathematical infinity but pragmatically of moral sovereignty, so that while the Roman Emperor governed the civilized world of antiquity God governs the entire universe, may something similar be the truth in regard to the Divine omniscience? In place of mathematical infinity, should we understand omniscience to mean that God's knowledge does not break down, as human knowledge is liable to do, through the multiplicity of details crowding out one another? In other words, instead of attributing to the true God that knowledge which the Greek poet attributed to Proteus of all things past, present and to come, should we say that God learns everything that happens and never forgets? Should this be a truer statement of what Christian truth should mean by omniscience, we should find perhaps a way in which the reality of human free-will was entirely reconcilable with a belief in God's omniscience. Of course, as a man of discernment can often foretell how an individual man or a body of men will act or re-act to certain conditions and circumstances, God similarly foreknows how His creatures will act; but perhaps it may be that He does not always know; when our Lord was upon earth He foreknew what men would do, for "He knew what was in man." Yet I have wondered whether He always foreknew. Indeed, if we are not to fall into the Docetic error, I am not sure that we must not insist that He did not know till the very end that Judas would betray him. Rather I think we may say our Lord tried by His teaching and His appeals to win Judas to a nobler view of life. Those parables which St. Luke represents our Lord as uttering in the last few months or weeks of His ministry to dissuade men from the love of money seem to me directed to Judas's conscience. Again, after His Resurrection, do the words which we are told He gave as a message to His disciples, bidding them to go to Galilee where they should see Him, shew that He hoped that they would do so, but, because they did not go as He bade them, He was constrained to shew Himself to them at Jerusalem? Be that

as it may, I venture to raise the question whether the Divine omniscience is not of such a nature that the psychological argument is invalid, which would have it that because the Divine consciousness is infinite in a mathematical sense, its concentration within the limits of humanity is inconceivable.

So much for my efforts to put in a form which might be intelligible today the Pauline account of the Incarnation. I have still to consider Mr. Tremenheere's criticisms on Canon Hodgson. The critic does not use the language of modern psychology, but he raises the question, which, I fear this paper will leave still unresolved, as to how Canon Hodgson's unqualified interpretation of the Gospel narratives as the revelation of a human nature informed by Deity is compatible with any intelligible belief that the Divine Nature was indeed present in the Incarnate life. How can we suppose, he asks, that God, however truly Man, could be ignorant on matters of Biblical knowledge? "The men of Nineveh shall rise in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonah" cannot, he says, be explained away as a reference to some unhistorical legend since it is introduced in the neighbourhood of the historical Solomon. "If David therefore in spirit call him Lord" cannot be justified on the lips of our Lord unless David really wrote the Psalm which has been quoted. I cannot, myself, feel as strongly as did Mr. Tremenheere the force of this criticism. In the first place I cannot agree to consider that the questions of Biblical criticism and the like are to be regarded as things which would make it imperative that, if God became Incarnate, He must answer these questions correctly for the guidance of men. The seeking of the lost, the calling of sinners to repentance, the redemption of the world, do not seem to me to demand that mankind should be instructed on such questions as this. I will allow that it is possible to overstate this and to open too widely the gate to the possibilities of human error in utterances of our Lord and in His human judgment. I have had it said to me by a young Methodist that total abstinence from alcoholic drink had been so proved by modern science to be desirable and proper, that our Lord's example and His prescription of wine as the Sacramental vehicle by which we might drink His Blood were to be disregarded as errors occasioned by the limitations of His humanity. Yet, in spite of the dangers inherent in the complete and honest acceptance of the doctrine of true humanity in our Lord, no mere Docetic theory of an apparent humanity, we are, I should suppose, under an obligation to accept in full the orthodox dogma and to search for some reconciliation of it with our belief in our

Lord's Deity. I have sometimes thought that what a French writer, M. Binet, has described as dual personality may illuminate for us the way in which the complementary truths of orthodoxy may be accepted as by no means contradictory. After what may be loosely called an epileptic fit a person may awake with an entirely different personality, with different tastes and temper, and again after some other crisis there may be a reversion to the previous personality. This change-over, if I may so call it, from one personality to another may be repeated again and again. Mr. Dornford Yates has in one or two of his novels made use of this phenomenon. An attack of brain fever or a blow on the head may, as he tells his story, leave the victim to a life far different from that he led before. May not this by way of illustration suggest that in our Lord's Incarnate life there may have been two personalities in this particular sense simultaneously existent, or perhaps I should rather say existent as alternative possibilities? While putting on paper my meditations on this subject I have dipped into Dr. N. Micklem's book *What is the Faith?* and I see that he, like myself, insists that the Christian revelation demands our belief in our Lord's dual nature. I cannot indeed find much clarity of thought in his attempt to disentangle the significance of this belief and it is possible that what I shall say myself will not contribute much to the same end. I take from him, however, the word ego as a useful term to express what he and Mr. Tremenheere and I all seem to be desiring, something that will express the central core of unity behind such exhibitions of multiple personality as I have suggested. Some part of the criticisms which have been made by various theologians of one another in recent times when they have discussed various statements of Christological truth are perhaps explicable by the uncertainty and variety of psychological terminology which they have employed. Where I shall use ego, one will say consciousness, another personality, and these words again are given different significance by different writers. I conceive that if our Christology is to be orthodox we must say that the Divine Logos was the ego which condescended to dwell in the psycho-physical organism (to use Dr. Micklem's words) which, moving amongst men, received the name of Jesus, and that this ego on the one hand continued to act as the creator and sustainer of cosmic development and life and on the other thought and spoke and acted, ate, drank, slept, prayed and died as Man.

When we have said this we have by no means escaped from all our obscurities and mysteries. Dr. Sanday, it may be remembered, suggested that the union of the Divine and human in our Lord might be made intelligible if it were supposed that

all the conscious processes in His thought were human and that the Divine dwelt in the subliminal or subconscious self. Others have said that this theory in reality destroyed His true humanity since a subliminal self is a necessary part of a human being. This, as what I shall presently say may suggest, may not be a conclusive and final demolition of the theory. There is, however, in any case, the doubt whether the subliminal self is not in reality a psycho-physical continuation or summary of the innumerable processes of a man's human and animal ancestry, so that from it spring the animal instincts and impulses upon whose organization, subjugation and co-ordination the building up of a human personality depends. If that should be so, we must, I suppose, attribute to our Lord this inherited subconsciousness from which in some measure the temptations He endured would spring.

I have heard it said that, unless our Lord was tempted, as we are, in such a way that there was the possibility of His consenting to a rebellion or recalcitrance against the eternal purpose of God, we, who desire to follow in His steps, lose the stimulus of knowing that He has led the way for us by invariably choosing the right and rejecting the wrong and thereby giving us an example. This view must on fuller consideration appear to be based upon our own fancies and desires. It is, perhaps, flattering to human nature to assure itself that what one has done successfully others can do. Nevertheless, it is our duty honestly to face realities and, having grasped so far as we can the truth of actual history, then to fashion and formulate our interpretation of that truth and to draw from it the stimulus and encouragement that it can afford. The books of the Sacred Canon present, it may be claimed, when we read them without allowing any pre-judgment to control our interpretation of them, an Incarnate God who has voluntarily confined Himself within the limitations of Manhood as it existed in a particular age and place. This Manhood felt the temptations of humanity and yet being God could not yield to them as we know that we are liable to yield to them. If this be a true statement of the facts, it would seem that we may correctly say that God previously to the Incarnation knew, as it were, from outside, and by an omniscient sympathy, the temptations and the weaknesses of the men and women whom He had created, but, by taking human nature upon Himself, He felt in that human nature the full force of temptation and learnt, as it were, from the inside of humanity how powerful is the infection of sin. So it is that He can now "succour them that are tempted," and we find our comfort and encouragement in the knowledge that, because He is Himself Man, He understands our weaknesses

and, because His life has gained ubiquitous and eternal potency by its self-surrender, carried even to the length of dying, His spirit, in complete human understanding and in Divine supremacy, can strengthen our spirits to resist and overcome our lower nature. It may be said that this raises a doubt as to whether we ought not to suppose that in our Lord's human nature original sin existed, if original sin can properly be interpreted to be the propensity derived from our human and animal ancestors to recalcitrance against the right. On this view temptation springs from this original sin or inherited propensity, and the fact of our Lord's temptation implies the fact that in Him there was this propensity. If we are right in so stating the matter, it must be observed that the fifteenth Article of our Church must be carefully limited, so that, when it is said that He was clearly void from sin both in His flesh and in His spirit, we shall assert without qualification that He was void of sin in thought, word and deed, but we shall exclude from this assertion original sin, meaning thereby the inherited propensity which invites and incites to sin. It is to be remarked that this view negatives the basic grounds for adhesion to the modern Roman dogma that the Blessed Virgin herself was immaculately conceived so that our Lord should inherit no such propensity.

If we cannot with Sanday replace with Deity the humanity in our Lord's subliminal self we must look elsewhere for some way in which we can reconcile our two postulates that He was Divine and that He was human.

It has been repeatedly observed that, when a person is hypnotized, although in the hypnotic state he will obey the suggestions made to him by his controller, yet he will not comply with an order compliance with which would offend against his moral beliefs, *i.e.* the principles he has developed in his conscious or unhypnotized state. May not this suggest, by some faint analogy, a way in which the Divine ego of our Lord would guide His human thought and judgment in regard to moral conduct, while leaving Him, so far as literary criticism, historical knowledge, scientific theories are concerned, in the same position as the men of His time and place ? If this be so, God did indeed intervene in the world's history by coming amongst us, and, through His ego, both Divine and human, worked out our redemption by attracting to Himself subjects who accepted His kingship, and thus initiated a human society who accepted the Divine rule as transcending all earthly motives and ambitions, a society who believed the good news that God was seeking the return of all sinners into the way of righteousness and who accepted as the guide for their lives the spirit of their

King. This means that, while the Kenotic language of St. Paul does teach us much as to the significance of the Incarnation, and while we hold fast to the orthodox rejection of Docetic teaching, we are not to emphasize the complete humanity of our Lord in such a way as to recognize only one nature or one will in His Incarnate life.

It is no doubt true, as Mr. Henry Moss has asserted in his recent work on the Dawn of the Middle Ages, that rivalry between the great university city of Alexandria and the new metropolis of the Empire Constantinople had much to do with the debates between the Orthodox and the Monophysites and Monothelites. Nevertheless, in spite of this deplorable ground of dissension we may gratefully assent to the orthodox tenets which eventually triumphed from Constantinople. The eternal will of the Logos, as Dr. Micklem urges, never faltered in its purpose to redeem mankind. The human will of the same ego, *i.e.* of the Logos now become Man, won through to obedience with tears and agony. It is here that we must part company with those who join with us in asserting the completeness of our Lord's humanity but who account Him as "a man," one among the numberless millions of men, distinguished from the others only by the superiority, the supremacy, as they will say, the uniqueness, as they will occasionally say, of His character and teaching. Were this an adequate account of our Lord's position in the history of the cosmos and of humanity, it would, I am convinced, be hard to give an intelligible meaning to the New Testament declarations that He was come or sent to fulfil, to seek and to save, to give life, to establish a new covenant. It should seem rather, that if He were one man with many brethren, a creature, himself needing to discover the way of approaching God, He could hardly be spoken of in the terms used in the New Testament, which must, I conceive, demand something higher and greater than a preacher, a teacher, a prophet. If He be God come to redeem mankind there must be in His ego something which guarantees that He will make no error in the spiritual content of His teaching even if there be mistakes of history, of science, of literary criticism. He must be free, from the very first moment of His humanity's beginning, from any fault of self-centredness, of selfishness, of anti-social choices, of rebellion against the Divine will. This, as I conceive, demands that His ego shall throughout be on one side entirely Divine. Otherwise, if His soul were like ours, merely a battleground between the Divine spirit and evil impulses, how unbelievable that even once in the infinity of human creatures one life should be led where the victory of good was always assured. We need not follow the curious speculations which such a view would

suggest. It is simpler, I would maintain, to hold fast to the orthodox dogma that in this one life God Himself was present, however we are to try to make intelligible to our finite minds the parallel existence in Him of a Divine eternal purpose and of a human psycho-physical organism employed to achieve in time and place before men's eyes and in their company that eternal purpose. I have therefore now come to feel that the old Greek fathers were right when they insisted that the orthodox expression of the Faith required us to say that our Lord was Man, not, as Dr. Du Bose has preferred to say, a man. We may grant that the Roman officials would enter on their census returns the name of Jesus, son (we may presume that they would say) of Joseph and Mary, living at Nazareth, but with Bethlehem as His place of origin. To them He would be a man, one of the millions of Jews then living in the world. Yet to this extent I am convinced that we are to be Docetists and to say that He was not a man, one more of God's creatures, but the Divine Logos dwelling amongst men as Man. Save for this one exception we shall assert that He was in every sense of the word a man, so that, as I have already said, He truly slept and truly died.

This distinction between "Man" and "a man" requires, I have found, further elaboration and elucidation. It is intended as the equivalent of the distinction between ἄνθρωπος and ἄνθρωπός τις, but does not give an entirely adequate equivalent. The latter expression may be said to mean that out of the multitude of created beings who exhibit the generic qualities of humanity a particular example is in question. The former expression, in contra-distinction to this, is intended to express that the person of whom it is said exhibits in all respects the qualities which by a process of logical selection we connote as found universally in humanity but not in other created beings. At the same time this form of expression excludes the assertion that the person to whom it is applied is just one of the multitude of created human beings. This leaves room for the belief that our Lord was in every particular human and yet that His ego was not created so that He was just a human creature as we are, but that the Divine ego clothed itself in humanity.

It has sometimes been thought that the truth could be determined by formulating the question, "Had our Lord a soul to save?" As usually, this attempt to present a dilemma fails of its purpose or misleads, because, in order to give a true answer, the terms in which it is expressed require analysis and elucidation. When it is said that a man has a soul, what would seem to be meant is that every human being is intended by his Creator so to co-ordinate and regulate the powers,

intellectual and physical, which are at his disposal through his incarnation that his personality with its moral capacity of self-determination is so united with the Divine and Human Word that He will account it to be one of those worthy to participate in the spiritual life of eternity—to use St. Luke's words, οἱ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν. Here is no question of a "soul" as opposed to some other part of human nature. It is not, as in the words of the Quicunque Vult, "of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting." The dilemma does not exist that we must either affirm our Lord to have had a "soul" as all men have or else must deny Him to have been fully Man. He had a physical body; He had a rational intelligence; He had not a second ego such as animates ordinary humanity. His Divine ego was Incarnate in a human nature possessed of rational intelligence and physical powers and during His Incarnate life established absolute control over those powers and that intelligence so that they subserved the Divine purpose of the Incarnation. The Divine ego thus added a human nature and a human will to the Divine nature and the Divine will of the Word, but a created human ego was not united to the Divine ego as if a man had grown up who, by triumphing over all temptations, was judged worthy to be united with Deity at his baptism. It must be admitted that we are here unable to attain to clear definition of truth. Did we indeed imagine that we had done so it would be reasonable to infer that we were involving ourselves in some error. Despite all the investigations of physiology and psychology human nature remains a mystery, and if we are unable to do more than penetrate a little further than previous generations could do into the mysterious facts of human personality, it is inconceivable that we can do more than faintly apprehend what the Incarnation must really have been.

We are, indeed, here confronted with a mystery of ultimate reality, a mystery which for us—at any rate at present—must remain insoluble since it is beyond our powers adequately to explore. Yet, as we Christians believe, all such mysteries are not irrational and therefore are not to be brushed aside as if those theories only are credible which admit of crisp and clear statement in the language of today. The Naturalistic philosopher admits nothing into his scheme of the universe except what can be observed by the human senses and intelligence or inferred from such observations. Though not a Materialist, and though recognizing the intellectual and moral values, he does not acknowledge any ultimate reality beyond and behind what he calls an urge or nisus, discernible within the cosmic

process, making for progress towards nobler and more spiritual ideals. We Christians postulate a Person whose working, we contend, is discernible in this nisus, and to us it seems more rational to interpret this nisus as the purposive action of a Person. We hold that this Person was, and is, the originator, the organizer, the controller and director of the cosmic nisus. In the same way I suppose that we should say that, whatever fresh theories the psychologist may promulgate as to the internal motives in human nature, and however well established those theories may be by observation, experiment and logical cohesion, our Christian belief will remain unaffected that the Holy Spirit is active in those impulses, motives or urges which the psychologist observes, tending towards the achievement in our own lives and in human society of nobler ideals. In a similar way it may be suggested that within the psycho-physical organism known to the world as Jesus of Nazareth the Divine Logos was working for the achievement of such a human life as was necessary for the redemption of the world. The psychologist may tabulate and catalogue the thoughts, words, and acts of our Lord and may be able to interpret them in terms of a naturalistic philosophy, but this would not invalidate our Christian belief that the unseen actor behind and beyond what the psychologist can discern, is God the Son. If Dr. Sanday's view be rigorously expressed so that we say that in our Lord's subliminal or subconscious Self no less than in His conscious Self everything was present in the same way that it is present in all men, but that there was in Him something more, not replacing anything appertaining to ordinary humanity with something else which was Divine but adding to the common stock the presence of Deity, then perhaps we may say that such a view is compatible with the full orthodox faith. The Holy Spirit, we may say, was active in our Lord's human consciousness and in His subliminal Self in the same way as He is active in ordinary men, inspiring what the psychologist can interpret as men's higher impulses, but in our Lord there was further a Divine element which is not present in the ordinary man.

There is one point on which I may be permitted a word. If the Orthodox Faith be as I have contended, how are we to understand the descent of the Holy Spirit upon our Lord at His baptism? I should suppose that we are to say that His human nature had to develop and to strengthen in the same way that ours must do and that therefore, though on the one hand His ego was Divine, yet because on the other hand that ego had taken upon it human nature that in it He might express the Divine character, everything that is of value to us for the strengthening of our spiritual capacities was of value to Him also. The

thought further suggests itself that here we find what confirms us in our belief that the grace and assistance of the Holy Spirit is given in increasing measure to meet increasing duties. Before His public ministry we must suppose the Holy Spirit to have assisted His human nature to grow in grace; for the public ministry an additional outpouring of the Holy Spirit was to be sought and so perhaps at various other crises in His life—as, *e.g.*, when He chose the twelve Apostles. This view would seem to commend our practice when we have Holy Baptism followed by Confirmation, and again, for those who are called to the Sacred Ministry, Confirmation followed by the Ordering of Deacons, the Ordaining of Priests and the Consecration of Bishops. It may be remembered that Dr. N. P. Williams has argued that "grace" is really the "Holy Spirit" operating upon men and in consequence he challenged the orthodoxy of Newman's lines:

> "And that a higher gift than grace
> Should flesh and blood refine,
> God's Presence and His very Self,
> And Essence all-divine."

As you may guess, I have now come to think that Cardinal Newman is nearer the orthodox truth than is Dr. Williams. The Holy Spirit gives grace to all men, but our Lord was not a man receiving such grace; He was God Incarnate, and if we could alter Newman's higher gift into a greater or fuller gift his statement would seem to be more truly orthodox than the professor's.

I fear that I have not done much to elucidate what must remain a mystery, but I feel that it is our business continually to endeavour by illustration to make intelligible what we have been taught to believe, and at any rate to put the orthodox tradition into language which is intelligible to the men of our time. It seems to me futile to set out to teach the fundamentals of the Faith by merely reiterating the old words. They have lost their freshness; their metaphors are outworn; often they have passed out of the categories of contemporary thought. Let us, while holding fast to the Orthodox Faith, which by a study of the old language in which it is expressed we ourselves can apprehend, do what we can to re-express the Faith in the language, metaphors and the categories of modern thought.

One word by way of corollary would seem to be needed. I have heard the comment that if Christianity offers to its adherents articles of belief requiring the technical terminology of theological science it is ill adapted for universal serviceableness as a religion. I whole-heartedly agree that the essence

of the Gospel message can be expressed in a few words and those so simple that the most untutored mind can understand them. Yet I conceive that there is room also for the thinker and the educated man in the Christian Church and therefore for continual effort to articulate the implications of the simple Christian creed in the language of the best scientific and philosophic thought of each succeeding age.

T. Nicklin.

RELIGION IN THE ENGLISH "PUBLIC SCHOOL"

(Observations of an American Visitor.)

Dr. Bell spent last summer studying the problem with which this paper deals. The heads of those private Church boarding-schools which correspond in America to what the English call "the public schools," and all those who know the boys who are in such schools, will be interested in Dr. Bell's cautious but understanding article.

It has been my privilege of late to make a study of the teaching and practice of religion in a number of the English "public schools."* In it, I do not pretend to have been complete or scientific. That would have been impossible in the time at my disposal. But my examination has been of some degree of thoroughness, notwithstanding, for to it I have been able to bring a considerable preliminary reading and correspondence, as well as eyesight and hearing sharpened by a good many years of educational study and practice. And I hope that no one will regard this brief paper as a serious and considered report. It merely reflects a few first impressions. In my attempt to see the whole picture, I have received most helpful co-operation from some of the principal English headmasters and school chaplains, from associations dealing with British religious teaching problems in general, and from ecclesiastical authorities; and in several places I have enjoyed, at the headmaster's suggestion, free access to prefects and other top boys, who have given me, frankly and intelligently, the reactions of those who are completing their experience of school life and its scheme of religious culture.

As a result of my investigation, I have no *ex cathedra* pronouncements to make; but it may be interesting, and not impertinent, if I state four general observations, and then

* In America we call the same sort of institution a "private boarding school."

cite certain suggestions for improvement that seem to me interesting—suggestions not originating with me but which, rather, I have heard from those responsibly at work on the problem. These seem to me worthy of thought, even if and when they are not necessarily worthy of unqualified endorsement.

First, I am more than ever impressed by the vital importance of sound training, in Christian cult, code, and creed, of the boys in these leading schools of the nation. Nothing is more vital to the welfare of religion. The time to teach religion is in the secondary school years, not so much at the universities. The English understand this as much as we Americans forget it.

Second, the religious training seems, on the whole, to be given with an ineffectiveness that is somewhat surprising, especially in view of the remarkable improvements that have been made during the past forty years, in these same "public schools," in respect to the teaching of history, science, literature and (to some extent) the fine arts.

Third, the authorities, and particularly the headmasters, are well aware of this defect, deeply deplore it and earnestly desire to correct it. For this they should have more credit from the general public than they seem to be receiving.

Fourth, the headmasters seem considerably at a loss as to what to do about it all. They seek advice and welcome sympathetic criticism, provided that criticism shews any real knowledge of the problems of school administration. They resent a little the denunciation that has been heaped on their heads of late, because it seems to imply that they are foolish devotees of that combination of sentimentality and "playing the game" to which has been given the name of "public school religion." This they are not. They feel, also, that for the most part their critics fail to recognize the legitimate and unavoidable difficulties inherent in the whole administrative task. The headmasters do not need castigation, but rather an informed assistance, if Church authorities or specialists in religious pedagogy have any to give.

There are four principal problems that seem to present themselves to every contemporary public school which wishes to improve its religious training. Here they are, together with what seem, to me at least, an interesting suggestion or two on each, emanating from various English sources. These suggestions are being considered in many places, and sometimes acted upon.

I. *The Problem of Organization.* Suggestions:

(*a*) The headmaster is altogether too busy a person to have immediate supervision of the religious life of a school. He must, of course, be the

ultimate authority; but he cannot very well continue to be the immediate authority. Nor does he commonly feel competent so to be, especially today, when he is usually a layman and almost never a trained teacher of religion. He needs a dean or chaplain, one who is much more than a service-taker and routine master; rather, one who can organize all the instruction in religion, correlate it with worship, act as counsellor of masters and boys, in short be " pastor of the school." He should be as well paid as any senior master. He must be a gentleman, a man of character and some definite charm, and competent to teach not only the Bible but doctrine and apologetics. He should be a man of experience outside the schools, but also aware of the problems peculiar to them. Where can such a man be procured ? That is the chief problem of the English " public school " as it contemplates improvement in religious effort.

(*b*) Instruction in " divinity " can no more with competence be given by amateurs than can instruction in chemistry or history. Therefore, such teaching by house-masters and form-masters, unless they have been examined by an expert and found adequate, and unless they work under continued and effective direction, should be done away with, and the " divinity " put in the hands of masters especially trained for it. These need not necessarily be men in holy orders; but they must be skilled, and their work must be supervised. It is sometimes objected that this destroys opportunity, for the house-master especially, religiously to influence his boys, *in loco parentis*. But the boys themselves seem quite sure that this objection is not well founded, and that such personal influence in matters religious is lessened when, as is frequently the case, they see their house-master revealing a considerable ignorance in these classes in " divinity " which he tries to conduct. And why, ask the lads, should one *in loco parentis* assume an ability, to teach his boys religion without competent assistance, which no *actual* parent would think of assuming ?

(*c*) It would seem advisable that a school should employ not only a full-time director of religion, but also not less than one assistant master in " divinity " for every 200 boys in the school, all of these to work as directed by the dean of religion or chaplain. That would give to each such master a weekly teaching load of twenty periods, each section being twenty boys and the sections meeting twice a week. The director himself cannot carry more than half that load, if he is to attend to his chapel, advisory and other duties. To employ extra masters for religious instruction need involve no increase, it is pointed out, in expense to the school, since form-masters, relieved of the burden of " divinity " instruction, can obviously carry a larger load than now they do in other subjects. But where are these new assistant masters for " divinity " to be found ? No one seems to be training men for such posts. Is this not a problem, first for the universities, second for the Church, which must furnish to such teachers a post-graduate training suitable for their work ? The headmasters alone cannot handle this problem. Training facilities must be provided, and that soon.

II. *The Problem of what to Teach in " Divinity " Classes.*

(*a*) *The entering boy, even more than others, needs definite objective instruction.* He comes up, commonly, knowing next to nothing of religion; and he is not usually from a religiously-inspired home. The

only suggestion about this that I have heard, which seems interesting, is that confirmation study would best begin immediately the pupil comes to school, and last for at least six terms, two hours a week. Such training should cover, systematically and objectively, Christian creed, cult and code. At present the confirmation instruction, given at odd times in mid-school, is too short, too sketchy, and often too introspective and sentimental to be considered satisfactory, except in a very few of the schools. At any rate it cannot safely be *assumed* that the entering boy knows *anything* about religion.

(*b*) *The instruction of the sixth and upper-sixth forms* is also difficult, because their members are not so much docile lads as reasoning young men. The best suggestion here that has come to my ears has been that the master in charge should make up a syllabus of topics to be discussed, term by term, in conjunction with the boys themselves; they to say what they are troubled about; he to point out what the chief problems are. The syllabus once made, let the first session each week be devoted to the boys' own reaction to each of these problems as they see it; the second session, to the master's answer to that problem in the light of what they have said. This seems sound pedagogy, provided the boys have been properly instructed in fundamentals while in the lower forms. Otherwise, it would probably result, for the most part, only in sound and foam.

III. *The Problem of Worship.* Suggestions:

(*a*) The chapel attendance requirement, most observers think, should be lightened. Once on a time, two services on Sunday and prayers night and morning every week-day, was a normal thing in English life; but it is so no longer. To insist upon such a schedule at school seems to the boys stupid and abnormal. A larger proportion of voluntary services would probably produce a better atmosphere.

(*b*) Mattins and Evensong are tiresome to most modern boys, as well as to most masters, and a devotional life built too largely upon these choir-offices is almost certain to make school religion perfunctory, and often a positive bore. Certainly once a week is all of such devotion that should be required.

(*c*) One compulsory or "parade" service on Sunday is enough. Probably it is best held in the evening, so as to free the morning for voluntary devotions, especially for Communion.

(*d*) If services are to be voluntary and still get attendance, the Chapels and what goes on in them must be made more beautiful than they now are, and the boys must be taught the principles and methods of liturgical worship. In this connection, it may be noted that the boys themselves seem not to like those novel prayers and "varied" services which often their religious guides think will be helpful. A single touch of sentimentality is fatal. And, finally, there is not enough use being made of silent worship. There may easily be much too much doing, all the while.

(*e*) It would help if school chapels were reseated, so that, as in ordinary churches, the people faced the altar instead of one another choir-wise. The face-to-face seating conduces to self-consciousness and to lack of concentration.

IV. *The problem of relating the school to the parishes* from which the boys come and to which they will return. The two are leagues apart.

One suggestion is that confirmation instructions be shared—part done at school, part at home during the winter holidays. But will the home clergy respond and help ? Experiment along this line seems to indicate that a great many of them are too indifferent to do their share. No other suggestions have been made to me. Yet, obviously, this is one of the most important of all the problems.

Let me, in conclusion, say again that the " suggestions " given above are not mine, but have come from those who graciously have revealed to me the practical difficulties involved in revitalizing Christian teaching and practice in the English " public school." I have been too intent to know what those engaged in this important work are thinking and saying, to offer any ideas of mine. Only one thing I may say as on my own—namely, that headmasters and chaplains greatly need, and merit, the understanding, sympathy, prayers and counsel of their brethren in the Church at large, and of parents who observe the religious reactions of their sons. The task is more complicated and difficult than most people seem to understand.

Bernard Iddings Bell.

THE UNCHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF MAN

The Christian doctrine of man is incomplete without the Christian doctrine of God. Separated, they issue merely in perverted half-truths. An acceptance solely of the Christian view of God would result in a selfish pietism. For the products of what may be termed Christian atheism, one may turn to the works of Baudelaire or Thomas Hardy. Despair is the natural result of accepting the pessimistic Christian view of man without the optimistic belief in a divine Saviour. Man of himself is incapable of perfection; he may repent, but his repentance must be crowned with divine grace; faith must co-operate with grace. Sin must first be forgiven before reconciliation between God and man becomes feasible.

The aim of this paper is to consider briefly such views of man as seem incompatible with Christianity; on the philosophical side humanism, and on the political side liberalism and the totalitarian state, seem to be influences hostile to living upon the Christian plan.

If we desire a concise definition of humanism, we may go back to Protagoras: " Man is the measure of all things, of what is, that it is, and of what is not, that it is not." Primarily this

is a contribution to the theory of knowledge, but it has also its practical consequences. If there be no objective truth, there is also no revelation; and without revelation divine standards are at best uncertain.

A fuller expression of this attitude to life may be found in the famous chorus of Sophocles' *Antigone.*

"Wonders are many, and none is more wonderful than man; the power that crosses the white sea, driven by the stormy south wind, making a path under surges that threaten to engulf him; and Earth, the eldest of the gods, the immortal, the unwearied, doth he wear, turning the soil with the offspring of horses, as the ploughs go to and fro from year to year.

"And the light-hearted race of birds, and the tribes of savage beasts, and the sea-brood of the deep, he snares in the meshes of his woven toils, he leads captive man excellent in wit; and he masters by his arts the beast whose lair is in the wilds, who roams the hills; he tames the horse of shaggy mane, he puts the yoke upon its neck, he tames the tireless mountain bull.

"And speech and wind-swift thought, and all moods that mould a state, hath he taught himself; and how to flee the arrows of the frost, when 'tis hard lodging under the cold sky, and the arrows of the rushing rain; yea, he hath resource for all; without resource he meets nothing that must come; only against Death shall he call for aid in vain, but from baffling maladies hath he devised escapes.

"Cunning beyond fancy's dream is the fertile skill which brings him, not to evil but to good. When he honours the laws of the land, and that justice which he hath sworn by the gods to uphold, proudly stands his city: no city hath he who for rashness dwells with sin. Never may he share my hearth, never think my thoughts, who doeth these things" (Jebb's translation).

There is piety here, though the gods are considered mainly as supplying the supernatural sanction of morality, but man's achievement is his own. He may conquer everything except death, but he faces death confidently. There is no sense of sin, no tendency to ascribe success to God and failure to ourselves.

This humanism is a natural attitude which tends to reappear at times of great advance and achievement. Authority, human and divine, is repudiated, and for a while man thinks he is able to stand by himself and is justified by results. This is the time most difficult for religion. Success and prosperity may make man generous and liberal, but not religious.

If we desire to contrast the religious and the humanistic attitudes towards man we may set beside Sophocles a few verses from the eighth Psalm (vv. 4-8):

" What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him ?

" Thou madest him lower than the angels to crown him with glory and worship.

" Thou makest him to have dominion of the works of thy hands, and thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet;

" All sheep and oxen, yea, and all the beasts of the field;

" The fowls of the air, and the fishes of the sea, and whatsoever walketh through the paths of the seas.

" O Lord our Governor, how excellent is thy name in all the world !"

Man's achievements are here attributed to God's favour. There is nothing specifically Christian about this Psalm. Its author views the world with glad confidence and returns thanks to its Creator. If a generalization may be hazarded, the Jewish view of man is brighter than the Christian, because the Jew had a less certain hold upon immortality, and so was partly precluded from otherworldly compensations. There is a tendency in Christian thought to exaggerate the contrast between heaven and earth, to be unduly pessimistic about this world and too optimistic about the next. It is curious to note that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews by implication lowers the status of man by identifying the Psalmist's son of man with the Christian, whereas it originally referred to mankind.

Though the gladness of Sophocles' vision did not last and the Greek had his moods of pessimism when he doubted whether birth were a boon, humanistic standards continued to prevail. The self-sufficiency of the Stoic and the tranquillity of the Epicurean were to be achieved by man's unassisted efforts. It is doubtful if any Greek would have so far despaired of the innate reasonableness of man and so abandoned the intellectual view of conduct as to feel with Jeremiah (xvii. 9): " The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked: who can know it ?"

The attitude of the Greeks disappeared before what would have seemed to them the morbid fancies of Paul and Augustine. At the Renaissance for a brief period man tended to forget his dependance upon God in the exultation of his own achievements. Hamlet's soliloquy represents the sober close of this period of brightness, obscured by the acrimony of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation.

"What a piece of work is a man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form, in moving, how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a god! The beauty of the world! The paragon of animals! And yet, to me, what is this quintessence of dust?"

However dismal and one-sided the Reformation may seem in its hostility to Pelagian views, and its belief in the inability of man to work out his own salvation unaided, the doctrine of original sin, though devoid of historical basis, does at least recognize the initial flaw in human nature. In this respect it may be compared with the theory of the Social Contract, which, though historically false, attempts to explain how consent is fundamental to government.

With the eighteenth century humanism passes into liberalism. From man's growing power to change his environment is inferred his power to change himself. For the fallen Adam is substituted the noble savage. A pathetic belief in the efficacy of reason widely prevails, and the perfectibility of man is generally credited. The evil in man's nature is ascribed to environment or to the wickedness of those who have usurped authority over him. Utopia will come when the last king is strangled with the bowels of the last priest.

The general good taste of the eighteenth century kept these sentiments within the bounds of decorous expression. The crude and defiant blasphemy of Swinburne's Hymn of Man (during the session in Rome of the Œcumenical Council) is a product of the nineteenth.

"The herds of kings and their hosts and the flocks of the high priests bow
To a master whose face is a ghost's; O thou that wast God, is it thou?
Thou madest man in the garden; thou temptedst man and he fell;
Thou gavest him poison and pardon for blood and burnt-offering to sell.
Thou hast sealed thine elect to salvation, fast locked with faith for the key;
Make now for thyself expiation, and be thine atonement for thee."

. . . . . .

The poem closes:

"O thou the Lord God of our tyrants, they call thee, their God, by thy name.
By thy name that in hell-fire is written, and burned at the point of thy sword,
Thou art smitten, thou God, thou art smitten; thy death is upon thee, O Lord.
And the love-song of earth as thou diest resounds through the wind of her wings,
Glory to Man in the highest! for Man is the master of things."

It is from such over-confidence that there arises the greatest of recent illusions, the belief in the capacity of education ultimately to right all wrongs. Up till almost the present time

one could gather from the leading articles of radical papers that it required only the expenditure of enough money on education to usher in a new world. In fact, the products of cheap and widespread education were among the first to turn against the system that bred them; the unwanted and unemployed graduates of Germany were the most fervent supporters of Hitler. The great achievements of the last century in the technique of instruction and persuasion have been perverted to the uses of modern propaganda. The diffusion of education has merely made the ordinary man more gullible. Though education has rendered men gentler and more tractable, they may now be worked up into a sustained ferocity impossible before. The pugnacious savage prefers an occasional raid to the unremitting and industrious cruelty of modern warfare. Of few generations is the opinion of William James truer than of this: "Man, biologically considered . . . is the most formidable of all beasts of prey, and indeed the only one that preys systematically on its species."

If the liberal attitude be incompatible with the Christian view of man, even more is that of the totalitarian state. Liberalism at least is at one with Christianity in respect for the individual as an end in himself, even though its anthropology be unduly optimistic and condemned in advance by the Church as Pelagian. But Christianity is utterly inconsistent with the view that man's primary end is to serve the State as citizen and soldier, and to rear sons to follow him in this work.

The Christian view of man could coexist with liberalism because liberalism was tolerant, but logically the totalitarian state would either produce a new religion or reduce the existing religion to the devotional quietism of a few. If the Church may profit from the decay of political liberalism, through a wider awareness of failure and sin, the increasing efficiency in persecution is likely to make the continued prevalence of the Christian view of life in some continental countries uncertain.

The low view of man in his moral and political capacity taken by the totalitarian state has its intellectual counterpart in the efforts of psychology, by purely rationalist methods, to demonstrate that man is an irrational animal. Though a rational creature may have rights, a lunatic forfeits them; but where all are more or less lunatics, talk of rights becomes irrelevant. Men are not to be persuaded, they are to be drilled.

This necessarily superficial sketch of views of man hostile to the Christian standpoint may facilitate the restatement of the Christian anthropology so as to touch the weaknesses of contrary views, and to turn men to a concept of their destiny,

neither servile nor ideal, neither sanguine nor pessimistic, but though originally stated in mythological language, essentially sober; the doctrine of the fall attempts to account for the evil inherent in man, and the doctrine of redemption the method by which he may, if he choose, rise superior to the evil.

P. R. SMYTHE.

MISCELLANEA

PASTORALIA

Recently a letter appeared in *The Times* with the title "Men and their Churches." Written by a member of the laity, it suggested that men and women in this country had not lost their care and love for their churches:

> "There is always money to be found for churches, but seldom for the clergy. Churches that are left open are never empty. Some come to look, some to pray, and some to sit, but as soon as a service begins they quietly leave. Why?"

Because, according to the writer of the letter, there is a lack of understanding between the clergy and laity, and for this lack of understanding the clergy are blamed. One knows quite well that the clergy are always subject to criticism, and that a great deal of the adverse criticism is unjustified; but even granted that, it has to be admitted that a large proportion of the laity feel that they are out of sympathy with their clergy.

We believe that this cleavage is caused in no small measure by the type of training advocated for the clergy in the majority of articles which appear under the title "Pastoralia." In those articles the ideal Parish Priest is portrayed as one who is living under semi-monastic conditions, and his life is a striking contrast to that of the Anglican parson of recent generations who has played so large a part in the life of this country. Such an article appeared in the April issue of this Journal, and we are partly concerned with statements made by that particular writer.

In the background there is always the idea of a dual standard—one standard for the priest and one for the laity, reminiscent of the Manichæan dualism which set up separate moral standards for the "elect" and the "hearers." It is difficult to find any such distinction drawn in the New Testament, where there is no place for that type of dualism; and provided there is no such distinction in standards, the priest only differs from the layman in that his vocation is to teach, to administer the Sacraments, and to conduct Divine Service, and that because of his vocation he is expected to shew the way of life and be a leader among the people. From that it follows that the asceticism of the priest (and by that we mean the discipline of life) should be the same as that of the laity. There will obviously be a difference in training, exactly in the same way as the schoolmaster and the electrician are trained in different ways, but presumably live by the same moral standard.

To place the priest upon an entirely different plane from the layman is, furthermore, contrary to reason. The priest is born a man and throughout his life is affected by the same laws and conditions as any other male member of the human race. Moreover, when the laity remember this they find it far easier to approach him. They feel that they can come to him as a man of God—one who is trying to live the Christian life under the same conditions as themselves. Nothing tends to alienate the Anglican laity more than the type of thought, which removes the priest to a far different level from themselves, and this is the chief argument against the

priest wearing his cassock while visiting his flock. Mr. Cassidy regards the wearing of the cassock while visiting, " not only as a reminder to himself of what he is by ordination and of whose business he is about, but it is also a reminder and a symbol to his people that religion is so great and grand a thing, and his care for their souls so real, that he is willing to be ' set apart ' wholly for this work of God . . . to the exclusion of any private interest or claim."

Now surely if the priest continually needs something to recall to him the nature of his vocation, he would find the wearing of a hair shirt a far more effective reminder, while the laity will not be convinced that the priest is set apart wholly for the work of God because he wears a cassock if they have not already gathered this from his mode of life.

The surest way of all to antagonize the laity and to place a barrier between them and the clergy is to stress the infallibility of the priest and the Church—a theory which has never found a place in Anglican doctrine. The mediæval priest was for the greater part of his time dealing with the illiterate serf, and the clerk in Holy Orders was very often the one man in a community with any education at all. But times have changed and today the laity have often reached a far higher intellectual level than the clergy, and at least the views of the layman can no longer be ignored. This means that a men's study circle within a parish proves of infinite value, but we would hardly care to describe the following as an ideal study circle.

> " As a supplement to visiting . . . or rather as an outcome of it, the writer found it possible and most profitable to persuade a small group of men (four in number) to come to his study one night per week. The ostensible reason given then was that, in view of so much misunderstanding about religion, they should come and give their priest an opportunity of explaining the Church's teaching, and afterwards they would be free to ask questions or argue. This enabled the priest to give them definite dogmatic teaching, after which there was never any mere fatheaded argufying."

The word " ostensible " suggests that the study circle is a clever trap for forcing upon the congregation " definite dogmatic teaching," and a denial of the whole meaning of the phrase " study circle." To treat the opinions of the laity in this country as " fatheaded argufying " is, to say the least of it, presumptuous, and the surest way to drive from the church the very large body of young people who have a sound education and have been trained to think for themselves.

The statement with which we quarrel most in Mr. Cassidy's article concerns the question of the marriage of the clergy.

> " The Anglican Church's permission for her clergy to marry has developed into a popular ' expectation ' that they will do so, and she has lost (with a few exceptions) the witness and inspiring support of a life obviously being lived for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake."

The logical implication of that sentence is this: If one is married one cannot be living for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake, and if the ideal moral standard of the clergy and the laity is the same, as we believe it must be, then married members of the laity can never live their lives for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake. In actual fact there is nothing more

plainly the will of God than that the majority of the human race should marry, and that in " that holy estate " men and women should live lives consecrated to the service of God, nor will the pastor's diligent study and reading of the scriptures lead him to a different conclusion. The Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. iii.) certainly suggest no barrier to the marriage of bishops and deacons!

> " In place of the inspiring support of a life obviously being lived for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake . . . we have substituted the parson and the parson's wife busily engaged in various good works and activities in order to keep the people attending church . . . which is not necessarily the same thing as ' living the life.' "

The distinction we fear is too subtle for us, for it is difficult to find more inspiring examples of lives lived in self-sacrifice for the cause of the Kingdom than those of the parsons' wives (for instance, in remote country districts), who in loyalty to their Master are busily engaged in various good works.

Nor will the clergy-house ever take the place in parochial life of the parson and his family. The proof of this is to be found in the representations which are continually being made by Parochial Church Councils to patrons or bishops to send to a vacant benefice a married man. The majority of the laity look to the family at the Vicarage as the centre of their Parish life, and the popular expectation that the clergy will marry is more than an expectation—it is a wish that they should do so. The wish is based partly on the desire for the Vicarage family to take a lead in parochial activities, and partly on the realization that a married man can sympathize and take a far greater share in the joys and sorrows of his people than one who is living under very different conditions from most of themselves.

To deprecate clerical marriage is to lower the conception of matrimony altogether—to regard it as a state which is not for the leaders of the people. It seems a paradox that many of the advocates of clerical celibacy are at the same time doing their best to preserve the ideals of Christian marriage in this land and to hinder any movements which facilitate divorce : a paradox, for they desire to remove from the midst of the people the witness and example of one more Christian home from every parish.

Nor must the evidence of history be ignored. In turning back to the Middle Ages for the ideal of the priesthood there is a danger of passing over the fact that in those centuries there were very serious scandals connected with the clergy, and although the Protestant historians are notoriously biassed in their opinions they were usually fairly certain of their facts. In any case, apart from any scandals, it is an acknowledged fact that the mass of the population degenerated during this period, because so many of the best men in the nation were in Holy Orders and therefore remained celibate and without issue; whereas, in direct contrast, in recent centuries a large number of the leaders in Church and State have come from Anglican clerical families.

We still believe that the monastic system has an important part to play in the life of the Catholic Church, and obviously some are called to take their place in religious communities exactly in the same way as some are called to the married state. There are various types of work

which experience shews can best be tackled by those who are living under monastic or semi-monastic conditions, but it is entirely contrary to Anglican tradition and the wish of the laity to insist on the ordinary Parish Priest adopting the same mode of life.

One other question of importance is raised by Mr. Cassidy, and that is the part the Priest plays in the social life of his community.

> "Many zealous priests feel that they must do something for these masses by deliberately seeking to attract them to some kind of 'sugary' gathering such as a P.S.A. or smoke concert. Now without ignoring the possibilities such meetings may afford, surely the cheapness or 'uncostingness' of these methods should make us look for a more excellent way."

It is interesting to discover that many zealous priests have the time to devote to P.S.A.s, for they are more usually at Catechism or taking Evensong at a mission church; but, granted that, if the Parish Priest can attract the laity to various social gatherings, he has achieved a very important work. Isn't it far better for them to find their amusement and social life in a sphere in which the priest is the leader, and sets the tone, than in any other sphere? No one pretends that social gatherings can ever take the place of worship or teaching, but they have their place, and anyone who has any parochial experience in, for instance, a Devonshire parish will be very surprised at the phrase "the cheapness and uncostingness of these methods." The organization of the social side of a parish often takes a very heavy toll of the strength and vitality of the parson and his wife, but as long as it provides a Christian sphere in which the congregation, and especially the young, find their diversion and amusement together as a corporate body, then it is supremely worth while. It is wrong to describe the various social acitivities with which the Anglican parson and his wife busy themselves as a cheap method of attracting souls; because they desire the constant welfare of their people they are naturally concerned for their leisure hours, when entertainments may allure which would injure those who are committed to their care.

Finally, is it possible that laity and clergy are often estranged because the priest is not really at home in the communion which he has joined? The Church of England has a very great tradition behind it, a tradition of which many of us are justly proud, but quite a number of those who are ordained in this communion seem genuinely dissatisfied with the doctrine, the mode of worship, and the whole character of this branch of the Catholic Church. Their real home does not seem to be within the Anglican Church at all, and unfortunately, with a few exceptions, they belong to the only school of thought which is producing any literature at all on the subject of "Pastoralia." We who are newly ordained feel that there is very real need for some contributions to be made in this branch of theology by priests who have laboured for many years in ordinary parish life, and who remain proud of, and loyal to, the traditions and the teaching of the great Anglican Church.

H. L. Franklin.
G. W. H. Lampe.

GROUPING OF PARISHES

With reference to the article by Bishop Knight in the April number of Theology, the establishment of Senior Schools in rural areas might with advantage be considered.

The reorganization of elementary education so that children of 11+ years attend a school situated in the centre of an area and not in their own village is having a remarkable effect on their outlook and exclusiveness.

These Senior Schools are becoming not only centres of education, but also cultural centres. In most cases the school is also an Evening Institute, and is being attended by an increasing number of adults, who first attend for the excellent "Keep Fit Classes" and go on through the light Arts and Crafts, Handicrafts, and Domestic subjects to the more usual ones, which frequently include Literature and Dramatics. As the Senior Schools are all required to have large playing fields, the physical side of the training given is developing into other forms of athletic activity, such as cricket, hockey, tennis, etc., so that not only the child, but also the older person is coming to regard as the unit, not the village, but the area.

The Senior School is frequently the depot for the County Library.

Further, the area which forms a convenient geographical unit for educational purposes is also found to be the unit for A.R.P. purposes —*i.e.*, decontamination centre, etc.

It is reasonable to suppose that this new orientation will have its effect on Church life, and in time it may be that this unit will become the unit for the Church instead of the Parish.

Such a development would greatly facilitate the grouping suggested by Bishop Knight and would extend the idea to the more remote parishes. Bishop Knight seems to visualize small parishes attached to a larger centre, whereas in rural districts a 240-280 Senior School would meet the requirements of, say, six or seven parishes of 500 souls each.

Such a group of parishes could be well managed by a staff of three priests, with all the advantages mentioned in the article, especially if the system of using laymen to conduct the offices, as is so frequently the practice in the Dominions, were adopted.

B. D. Godfrey.

SOME FUNDAMENTALS AT EDINBURGH

May I thank the Rev. W. C. G. Proctor for his very kind words in appreciation of my article on the Edinburgh Conference.

A word or two of explanation may clear up the points on which he comments. I wrote: "The Mass brings Calvary into our churches, spanning the centuries as the wireless spans the seas." The point of the comparison is the spanning of the *centuries*. As the wireless eliminates distance, so the efficacy of Calvary eliminates *time*—that is how the sacrifice of Christ "offered once on the historical Calvary" can be made present in the Mass at any distance of *time*, just as the one performance of a programme is received by wireless sets at any distance of *space*. Each Mass is an effective sacrifice because the efficacy of the One Sacrifice of Calvary is thereby placed at the immediate disposal of all who will

share in it, or, as we are accustomed to say, in the Mass the merits of Calvary are *applied* to our souls. [When the wireless set is on, one can of course go out of the room or stop one's ears—*or* listen and enjoy. So in the Mass we have a part to play, but the efficacy comes not from us but from Calvary. In fact the Mass is still more closely identified with Calvary and the Last Supper than is the wireless with the transmitting station, in that Christ, who offered His Sacrifice once, is not even locally distant from the altar, but is there, our one High Priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech.] It was the Reformers' denial of *any* sacrificial element in " the Lord's Supper " that met with condemnation at Trent, whereas the unique character of the Sacrifice of Calvary was really common ground.

I will not intrude on your space with a further discussion of comprehensiveness. I should only like to say one thing. I admitted that " capitulation " (which I offered as an alternative) did not quite express my thought. I am sorry that Mr. Proctor should have interpreted it to involve a " not being conscious of virtues present in other churches." If the " privileged guides," of whom I spoke, can be discovered, then they will be found to have preserved from the past that framework of teaching into which all that is good and true, wherever it be now, can find a home, and enjoy that freedom which comes from contact with the living fulness of truth. Nothing need be shed but mistaken ideas, at last recognized to be such; the virtues will thrive all the better for it.

For a fuller exposition of this line of thought, may I recommend Father Congar's recent book *Chrétiens désunis*, which was so well reviewed in a recent article in this Journal.

M. Bévenot, S.J.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Les Questions Liturgiques et Paroissiales.

The issue for December, 1937, contained less than usual of genera interest. A note contains a brief study of the ceremony of the blessing of the water at the Offertory: this originated at the papal Mass in the deacon's duty of pouring the water into the chalice—in the form of a cross. When the priest at Low Mass had to prepare the chalice himself, and only required sufficient for his own Communion, he came to make the Sign of the Cross over the few drops of water necessary. The prayer, as usual, was added later. The omission of the ceremony at a Requiem betrays the Requiem's private, rather than papal and public, origin.

In the issue for February, 1938, Dom M. Cappuyns restates the case for holding that the solemn prayers of Good Friday represent the regular daily formula of the prayers of the faithful in the Roman Mass of the fifth century (probably also in Southern Gaul and Africa). They certainly go back earlier than that, and will have dropped out of daily use some time before St. Gregory. The origin of the Lumen Christi ceremony on Holy Saturday is discussed in a brief note: like so much else, it only reached Rome late, apparently in the Carolingian missals, having originated in Jerusalem, and appearing both in Spain and central Italy long before Rome. Some lesser articles in this issue record methods

for restoring the sense of community in the offering of Mass. This is taken up in an important article in the May issue by Dom Anselm Robeyns, where in the light of thirty years of the Liturgical Movement he discusses the problem of " adaptation " of the Liturgy to assist this object. In particular, the question of the use of the vernacular for parts at least of the Mass is in mind. The author insists that the primary purpose is to ensure that the faithful in attending Mass have the true liturgical spirit—*i.e.*, the sense of sharing in the Church's corporate self-offering which is one with the eternal action of Christ. The vernacular does not necessarily contribute to this result. Dom A. François raises some of the same problems in another article. It is evident that the question of the vernacular will have to be faced before long: already it is permitted in some of the prayers and Benedictions in the Ritual—*e.g.*, for the diocese of Vienna—and Père Parsch, among others, would like to see it authorized for the Missa Catechumenorum.

Attention should be drawn also to Dom E. Moeller's study (May, 1938) of the origin of the Litany of the Saints, and of the processions of April 25 and the Rogation Days. The latter as well as the former now appear to have succeeded to pagan ceremonies of the same character.

H. DE C.

Ephemerides Theologicæ Lovanienses. November, 1937.

The first article in this number is an essay by Father Lottin, O.S.B., on the treatment of the acquired virtues in St. Thomas and contemporary writers. Under the influence of Augustine this side of moral teaching was somewhat ignored, but with the rediscovery of the Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle it came again into prominence in 1245 or thereabouts. Albert the Great and Thomas both adopted the theory found in Aristotle's sixth book. Natural or acquired virtues form a system wherein prudence takes the lead; they are connected just as human sciences are connected. Other teachers, however, were not so clear on this point, especially those who still looked with some suspicion upon Aristotelian thought. The writer concludes with some texts of the thirteenth-century Gerard of Abbeville. The next article is a continuation of the discussion of " Theology as a Science." In this instalment Father Bonnefoy, O.F.M., shews the difference of approach of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure on this point. Thomistic teaching emphasizes the distinction between " reason " and " faith," in sacred doctrine " reason is a stranger." To Bonaventure, on the other hand, the two walk much more closely together. It is only when reason breaks down that the authority of Scripture comes in. So Bonaventure is able to make greater concession to reason even in the matter of sacred science. A further instalment is promised to discuss the place which St. Thomas still allows to reason in this matter.

Under the rubric " Biblical Miscellanies," Father Coppens, one of the editors of this Review, gives a very interesting discussion of the text Genesis iii. 16b. The author remarks that this text has been the subject of unfavourable comment in certain " Anglican feminist publications." It has been misunderstood as formulating a judgment or sentence upon women, whereas it in reality only states a fact, one, indeed, among the many consequences of original sin, whose existence as a fact is only too obvious in these days of sexual laxity. Only a perversion of its meaning

could read into it, *e.g.*, anything like a prohibition of anæsthetics in childbed. There is an English article, on moderate lines, on the "Theological Conception of Mediation," with reference to recent Marian theories in the Roman Church.

Among the many reviews of books is one on a work of Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche*, which appears to be of some interest and also a very sympathetic account of Orthodox Christianity.

Altogether a very interesting number of this Review.

W. R. V. Brade.

In the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* Father Morin investigates the question to whom the work *De septem ordinibus Ecclesiæ* has been addressed. Father Weisweiler offers comments on a hitherto unknown manuscript, lying at Munich, on the Investiture quarrel. Father Baix remembers the centenary of the restoration of the Bollandists, and all that they mean to the documents upon which history reposes. Father St. Binon describes two important contributions to the history of St. Montagne. Father Debongnie raises the question whether St. Vincent de Paul has or has not lied. The bibliography of recent articles and recent books is one that no serious reader can afford to ignore.

R. H. M.

REVIEWS

Von Hügel and Tyrrell: The Story of a Friendship. By M. D. Petre. Preface by Canon Lilley. Pp. xiv +204. Dent. 7s. 6d.

This admirably told story of a friendship which indirectly, and even to some extent directly, affected many others besides is a smaller book than Miss Petre's former work *My Way of Faith*, and serves to illustrate certain aspects which had necessarily to be dealt with more summarily there. Taken together they make not only a valuable psychological study but also a contribution of historical importance. Opinions may differ as to the dictum in the preface that without Tyrrell " the leading Anglo-Catholic theologians of today would not have been what they are, nor would they have accomplished the something more than they consciously aimed at which is at once the test and the seal of all fine human achievement "; but the interaction of the minds of von Hügel and Tyrrell had results which are perplexing, humorous, tragic or all three at once according to the point of view. Von Hügel is already becoming the subject of legend, and the external characteristics of the man and his methods, commonly described with much similarity of phrase, may well seem to those who knew him to go little further than a portrayal of the personal appearance of Oliver Cromwell. Tyrrell was more difficult to characterize, and readers will be the more grateful for the sympathy and insight displayed in Miss Petre's interpretation. In some ways indeed she probably understood him better than he did himself, including the limitations in one direction which remain limitations however justly other singular endowments of spirit and mind may be regarded as compensation. It is inevitable that the book should set the two men in comparison, and wholesome and instructive as such comparisons may be it is hard to exclude every element of injustice, however unintentional the inclusion; and unless the characters drawn suggest themselves as so nearly complementary that the observer, conscious of the harmony, does not worry about the exact apportionment to each the result usually leaves some measure of dissatisfaction. For both the pursuit of what both believed to be Truth was hampered by the circumstances in which they found themselves, but the conditions were not equal even so. Readers of M. Loisy's *Mémoires* will recall a passage (ii. 42) as to von Hügel's relations with friends

at Milan in 1901: " Il y avait là le P. Gazzola, barnabite, 'le plus grand curé de la ville,' ancien abonné de *l'Enseignement biblique*. Lui-même avait été, vers 1889, 'dénoncé au Saint-Office, pour ses hardiesses doctrinales en chaire,' et il avait été 'chassé de Milan, mais pour une semaine seulement,' ses paroissiens, 'nobles et bourgeois,' étant allés 'en corps' avertir l'autorité civile et l'archevêque du lieu que, si on ne leur rendait pas 'leur P. Gazzola tout de suite, tant l'église que l'état à Milan s'en repentiraient.' Gazzola revint, 'et depuis lors personne plus n'ose le molester.' " There is another side to that picture in a letter from von Hügel quoted by Miss Petre (p. 80) " P[adre] G[azzola] has, as he told me himself, carefully kept himself from ever writing a word; and, partly on this account, he has been able, and continued, as parish priest of the largest parish in Milan, to do an astonishing amount, in the way of meeting the largely latent or semiconscious, but none the less terribly real, requirements of educated souls in matters of religion, especially within the Church." And it would be hard to find a better commentary on a warning in a letter of von Hügel to Tyrrell in January, 1898, written near the outset of their friendship: " As you know well by now, no doubt, I just simply live for my work, and that work requires as a *sine qua non* of, I will not say, success, but even of existence, a reputation for substantial orthodoxy, and even for prudence, sufficient to stand a good deal of strain." But it is difficult to think of Tyrrell acquiring a reputation for prudence: " You are born," von Hügel wrote to him in October, 1907, " to be daringly, deeply independent; just because of that, do not let any over-swiftness, any unlimitedness, any impatience with that dearest and greatest of the disguises under which God works in man—I mean love of friction and our poor bovine humble slownesses, of a goodly dose of stupidity—get into or anywhere find lodgment in that amazingly rapid nature of yours." And two sentences from Tyrrell's replies to von Hügel's letters set two aspects in at least as clear a light: " Had I believed as much as you do in the Modernist cause, I should probably have acted differently " (April, 1908); and " In your just revolt against the fallacy of simplification, I sometimes wonder whether you are not driven to value complexity for its own sake " (June, 1908). Canon Lilley observed in regard to Tyrrell: " How often he used to say to me: 'Please send us no more of your Gothic and Gregorian converts' "; but one may wonder if they were not the class likely to be happier in their new environment than the Tyrrell of whom Miss Petre has written elsewhere that he " was as complex as I was simple."

CLAUDE JENKINS.

UNION OF CHRISTENDOM. Edited by Kenneth Mackenzie, Bishop of Brechin. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

Was the Day of Pentecost the only day on which the Church ever spoke, or ever will speak, with one voice ?

On that day a company of sad and puzzled men were gathered together in expectation that a promise was to be fulfilled. They were sad because their Master had left them, and both puzzled and penitent because their love for Him had not been as strong as they had believed it to be. The fact that their risen Lord had not claimed the open homage that might have been His added to their bewilderment. Their faith, however, held firm; and they loved each other in the Lord.

Suddenly, then, the wonder and the joy came upon the expectant company, and God, Who is wont in His mercy to veil His glory from human sight, sent His Spirit flowing at full tide into souls that had been strengthened by sorrow and by love.

Each man saw tongues of fire upon his brethren's heads; and if the flame lit upon his own head, he was unaware of it. Moved by a common impulse, the company went forth to preach Christ crucified, risen and ascended to His Father; and to preach His Spirit, Who was giving the disciples the very words they used, and Who would guide them into all Truth.

" Whereas," observes " the world," " the Spirit has, as a matter of fact, done nothing of the kind."

At first sight such a criticism appears well justified; and Pilate, were he alive today, might enquire *What is Truth ?* with an even stronger shade of sarcastic emphasis.

The book which we are now considering—this symposium of hopes and expectations from men who are technically " separated "—gives a wonderful testimony, both conscious and unconscious, to the foundation of Unity in Truth that underlies a divided Church.

The first converts in apostolic days were, as in the case of Queen Candace's eunuch, baptized on a simple profession of faith in Jesus as the Son of God. The doctrine of the Incarnation had to be attacked, misunderstood and perverted before theologians could be guided to disentangle truth from error, and to present it in all its clarity. Yet today one can see that a body of believers has vitality in proportion to its faith in that central dogma. A leaning towards Unitarianism means a dying-down of life.

On the rock of the Incarnation, the Church of the Mystical Body of our Lord is even now rising. The Holy Spirit is actually at work, breathing into men's souls an irresistible longing for a Church that shall be one.

The Union of Christendom—a noble book on a noble theme. Such a work is an education in itself. It will educate the " ordinary Christian " not only in what he ought to know on the subject of Reunion, but also in what he ought to feel and to pray.

It is a matter for sorrow that so much education should be needed. " Roman Catholics !" exclaimed the superintendent of a Congregationalist Sunday School to me some years ago. " Don't speak to me of Roman Catholics ! They worship a woman and a bit of bread."

" O-oh !" was the astonished observation of an educated Anglo-Catholic lady to me the other day, " I always thought *all* Dissenters were Unitarians."

Our Lord's prayer that His children might be one had evidently not yet challenged these Christians' consciences.

A volume on Reunion quite rightly begins with a section on " The Sin of Disunion," and the Bishop of New York writes most vigorously thereon. A thoughtful paper by the Rev. V. A. Demant explains how Church unity is connected with human solidarity as a whole, while the Rev. G. D. Rosenthal shews how a united Church could form the basis of a Christian world-order, giving a stability to society that no mere secular humanitarianism can supply.

The next part of the book is devoted to the history of the Church's disruption, and to an explanation of its causes. Here are scholarly essays by experts such as Professor A. Hamilton Thompson and Miss B. Hamilton Thompson.

There are six papers on the present grouping of Christendom. The Dean of Exeter takes the responsibility of writing on the Anglican Communion. The non-Episcopal communions receive charitable treatment at the hands of the Bishop of Brechin, who, however, in no wise minimizes the obstacles to Reunion.

Sir Stephen Gaselee's account of the Uniat Communion should certainly be read in conjunction with the recent report of the Commission on Doctrine in the Anglican Church. Both shew in a most striking way that differences in doctrine are not as divisive as some people would have us think. It will come as a surprise to a good many Anglicans that a church in which the " filioque " clause is omitted from the Nicene Creed, the chalice is given to the laity, and whose priests may marry, is actually in communion with Rome. Anglican divergences in doctrine are, of course, a perpetual source of surprise both to Rome and to the Free Churches.

The pages to which many of us will turn most eagerly, however, are those which deal with " The Possibility of a United Christendom " from the standpoints of Roman Catholics,

Orthodox, Anglicans, Scandinavians, American Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists and Baptists.

If the essays by English Nonconformists are representative, they are a little disappointing. The conception of the Mystical Body of Christ is dim, and much prayer is needed before it can become vivid and operative. The Presbyterians seem to have the strongest "church-sense," and their position is well put by the Rev. J. Wilson Baird. The most beautiful and deeply felt appeal for unity is that which comes from Dr. Nicholas Arseniev. His wisdom is evidently the "brimming over of contemplation," and it is therefore much more illuminating than mere human reasonableness and resource.

Six chapters on the essential principles of Catholicism, among which we specially note the Rev. F. P. Harton's "Holy Living and Holy Dying," bring this valuable book to a close.

Will it help to bring about Reunion in 2038? If a thousand years are with the Lord as one day, we are certainly rather in a hurry if we look for Reunion within a hundred years. Could we, however, hasten the day by altering our tactics? Conferences and conversations may have brought the outlying sections of the Church as close to a central meeting point as is, at the moment, possible. Can we pause a little, and try to reproduce in each "church" the dispositions of the disciples' Pentecost?

Sorrow and bewilderment are there—the churches need to translate them into penitence and self-distrust. On the human side we have erred in thought, word and deed, and never more than when we desire to prove ourselves entirely in the right and everyone else at least partially in the wrong.

If the churches have sinned by lack of brotherly love, they have also sinned by widespread neglect of the Holy Ghost. Think for a minute of the religious books that you have read, of the sermons you have heard, and of your own thoughts and meditations. Ask yourself whether the Holy Ghost occupies His rightful place in Christian consciousness. How can His power become operative, and the dry bones of Christendom be reunited and quickened unless the Holy Ghost be adored and invoked, and invited to use our souls and minds according to His Will?

The Truth into which the Church will ultimately be guided needs to be *spiritually* perceived. As the churches purify themselves by penitence and by prayer, their spiritual sight grows clearer. They will *perceive* their unity, which even now is actual in what we call "Heaven."

Theologians will work out the intellectual implications of

spiritual unity, ecclesiastical statesmen will settle details of Church government. But the Holy Spirit Himself will manifest Himself as the Lord and Giver of the Church's life.

ÆLFRIDA TILLYARD.

THE DEGREES OF KNOWLEDGE. By Jacques Maritain. Translated by Bernard Wall and Margot R. Adamson. The Centenary Press. 21s.

This is a magnificent work. In it, in the course of nearly five hundred large pages, M. Maritain deals, by means of the purest Aristotelian-Thomist principles of epistemology, with every degree and type of human knowledge from the lowest form of sensory perception to the highest grade of mystical contemplation.

He prefaces his book with an introductory essay on the Grandeur and Misery of Metaphysics. Metaphysics gives us real knowledge of both the created world and God—this is its grandeur; but it raises questions that it cannot answer and evokes desires that it cannot satisfy—and this is its misery. The rest of the book is divided into two sections which deal with the degrees of rational and of super-rational knowledge respectively.

Rational knowledge—that is to say, knowledge that can be attained by the exercise of the human reason—takes its rise in the perception of sensible being. It is therefore necessary to maintain, whatever idealists and phenomenalists may say, that the human intellect, though weak and liable to error, is essentially capable of apprehending truth, and that what primarily falls under the operation of the intellect is not appearance but being. Phenomena, phantasmata, species (both sensible and intelligible) are not *what* is known in the act of knowledge but intermediaries *through which* being is known. They are not the *quod* but the *quo*. This is the fundamental principle of Thomist gnoseology, or, as M. Maritain calls it, *Critical Realism*.

The mind can abstract from things in three ways. In the first place, it " can consider objects only abstracted and purified from matter in so far as it is the foundation for the diversity of individuals in space " (p. 44); this leads to the realm of *Physica*, divided into Empirical Science and Philosophy of Nature according as the emphasis is placed on *sensible* or *being* in its object " sensible being " (and note that at the bottom of the diagram on p. 49 it is " sensible " that should be underlined and not " being "). Secondly, it can consider one particular

" property which it detaches from bodies—what remains when all the sensible is removed—quantity, number and extension taken as such " (p. 45); " this is the great kingdom of *Mathematica*." Lastly, " the mind can consider abstract objects from which matter has been entirely eliminated, where nothing remains of things but the being with which they are saturated " (p. 46); " this is the great kingdom of *Metaphysica*." Physics and Metaphysics have an immediate point of contact in the Philosophy of Nature, since they both deal with *real* beings—*i.e.*, " intelligible objects which *can exist* " (p. 49); whereas mathematics lies at the end of a kind of branch-line from physics (on which lies a complicated and recently reconstructed station called Mathematical Physics), since it " deals with an object which is not necessarily real, but which can just as well be fictive or imaginary "—*i.e.*, *rational* being.

There is an interesting remark on p. 222, where " some eminent scientists " are accused of having " been led to confound ' substance ' in the philosophical sense of the word with ' substance ' in the common interpretation." Presumably M. Maritain is thinking of some of the nonsense that has been written about transubstantiation. But may we breathe that perhaps no less eminent a philosopher than the Angelic Doctor may have been guilty of a similar confusion in the use of the word " matter "? For, having correctly observed that the angels have no matter in the common interpretation, he assumes that they have none in the philosophical sense either, and, since matter is by definition the principle of limitation, he is somewhat embarrassed to know how they are limited. Mr. E. I. Watkin in his *Philosophy of Form* is brave enough to assert that (using " matter " in the philosophical sense) there is spiritual as well as physical matter. It would be interesting to know what M. Maritain thinks of Mr. Watkin; the latter is certainly a neo-scholastic, as is seen from the fact that he bases his philosophy upon the scholastic notions of form and matter, but he is hardly a Thomist.

Against some of the modern physicist-philosophers, M. Maritain maintains that physical science is not purely descriptive but gives us a real knowledge of being, for, although it deals in abstractions—and very abstract ones at that—the function of abstraction, for the Thomist, is not to conceal but to reveal the nature of the being that it abstracts from. But one mode of abstraction does not rule out others, and although " it would be inexact to say that [the scientist] did not know this nature [*i.e.*, in the case considered, the nature of a flea] . . . he does not know it ontologically or *in itself* " (p. 199).

One of the most refreshing features of M. Maritain's

treatment of the philosophy of physical science and mathematics is his real knowledge of these subjects. He discusses at great length the philosophical bearings of mathematical logic, non-Euclidean geometry, Relativity and the Quantum Theory, and, whether the experts in these fields of thought agree with his views or not, they will at least be able to argue with him about them. This is not the case with all philosophers, neo-scholastic or otherwise.

But we must pass on to super-rational knowledge. Just as in the first section of his book M. Maritain's great authority is the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas, so here it is the Mystical Doctor, St. John of the Cross. Mystical experience has two great characteristics: it is knowledge by grace, not by nature (although grace perfects nature and does not destroy it), and it is knowledge of God by connaturality. It is *infused* contemplation, it is *supernatural*, and it is of a totally different order from poetic or philosophic " contemplation."

We can only comment on one or two salient points in M. Maritain's magnificent development of this subject.

(1) Is there any ultimate philosophical contradiction between the teaching of St. Thomas and of St. John ? There is not, we are told, because they are using different vocabularies. St. Thomas is writing *speculatively*, St. John *practically*; St. Thomas tends to be *philosophical*, St. John *psychological*. " Philosophical language wishes above all to define reality without feeling it, mystical language to define it, as though by feeling what it cannot see " (p. 401). And the essential agreement is even more striking because " the language of St. John of the Cross is in no way dependent on that of Thomism " (p. 393).

(2) Is infused contemplation open to all ? Apparently, yes. " The doctrine that all souls, by the very fact that they are called to the beatitude of heaven, have also a general and common call to enter here on earth by infused contemplation into the first fruits of this beatitude, *a doctrine which nowadays unites the best theologians* [italics ours. Shades of Farges, Billot, Benedict XIV(?) and the Carmelite Congresses in 1923 and 1928 !] is in entire conformity with the teaching of St. John of the Cross " (p. 423, n. 3). And see the very interesting footnote on p. 442 on the relation of the Active and Passive Nights.

(3) And what of acquired contemplation, of which we hear so much in these days when so much attention is being paid to de Caussade and his modern disciple Dom John Chapman ? Well, it exists, it " is supernatural in its object and by the virtue of faith from which it proceeds," but it " nevertheless remains natural in its mode " and, being " by definition alien from

the passivity which is proper to the supernatural mode of the gifts, cannot be called mystical. . . . On the other hand, bearing as it does on the mysteries of revelation, it is absolutely apart from and above, not only metaphysical science, but the whole order of the truths which are as such accessible by reason" (p. 345)

(4) What is the relation of St. Augustine to all this? There is an interesting short chapter "Concerning Augustinian Wisdom," which may be compared with M. Maritain's essay in *A Monument to St. Augustine*. "The essential difference between the teaching of St. Augustine and that of St. Thomas is one of point of view and of perspective" (p. 365). Thomas is "the heir of Augustine" (p. 372). Thomism is a system, the Augustinianism of Augustine was not (p. 377). And Augustine is not the same as Augustinians!

The concluding chapter *Todo y Nada* carries us to the summit of Mount Carmel, to the *iuge convivium*. In the spiritual marriage the soul is transformed into God Himself, not, of course, entitatively (St. John is no pantheist), yet, on the other hand, not merely by a moral union, but "physically" and ontologically by *an intentional being of love*, a notion which M. Maritain develops originally and at length (pp. 453 *sqq.*). And in this chapter there is a violent indictment of the present order and a stirring call to Christians. "It seems as if all the alembics of the invisible were at work to transmute all human things into the state of quintessence. . . . Everywhere the pure spirit, the essential essence, disengages itself and stinks in our nostrils. . . . The souls of men are subjecting themselves to a spirituality of the flesh, to an asceticism and martyrdom of the perishing moment. . . . Meanwhile many Christians, who judge their unhappy brethren from above, apply themselves to make an honest success of existence, and seek to support the interests of the Most High by considering theology presumptuous, asceticism superfluous, contemplation perilous, and the precept 'Be perfect' a work of supererogation. They are fighting with the bubbles on the surface of the torrent!" (p. 432). Here speaks the disciple of Bloy and the friend of Péguy, a second pilgrim of the Absolute, at war with mediocrity and *bien-pensance*. "Mighty portents, however, have risen on the far horizon of our most unhappy Europe. . . . The happy hour is coming when a man can die for God; not for the nation nor for humanity, neither for the revolution, nor progress, nor for science, but for God alone" (p. 433).

The translation leaves a good deal to be desired. There are also rather a lot of misprints, and—what deprives the volume of much of its usefulness—there is no index.

E. L. Mascall.

JOHN WESLEY IN THE EVOLUTION OF PROTESTANTISM. By Maximin Piette. Sheed and Ward. 18s.

Father Piette's *John Wesley: Sa Réaction dans l'Évolution du Protestantisme* (Brussels, 1925) has for the past twelve years been known and valued by students of the Methodist Movement and of the life and influence of Wesley. An English translation has long been overdue. It has now been supplied by an American priest, the Rev. J. B. Howard, who has done his work extremely competently.

The author's purpose is to exhibit Methodism in its wider context, and to shew how it evolved from previous Protestant movements and in what relationship it stands to other Protestant churches. His book is divided into three parts: Evolution of Protestantism before the Eighteenth Century; Protestantism in the Eighteenth Century, with particular and indeed almost exclusive reference to England; John Wesley's Movement. His main argument is that Wesley, repudiating Lutheranism and Calvinism alike, became the pioneer exponent of the religion of experience, stressing particularly the experience of conversion or New Birth, combined with certain features of the Catholic tradition, especially on its sacramental side. "If antinomianism—a theory deriving directly from faith without good works—made him sever all connection with Zinzendorf's Pietists and Lutheran dogma, his utter repugnance for the blasphemous consequences of absolute predestination decided him to declare open war on the eternal decrees, so dear to Calvin's heart. . . . His movement is by no means heir to the sects, which, during the first two hundred years of the Reformation in England, took their inspiration from Calvin. In his attitude he was unreservedly and always Universalist. We might add that he always remained a Conformist; but his conformity rested on historic tradition. . . . His leanings were —as was evident throughout his life—always to revert to the usages of the Primitive Church. Thus, from 1730, he prepared the way for the second Oxford Movement known by the name of Ritualism. . . ." (pp. 423, 476).

The most controversial section of the narrative is that which deals with Wesley's conversion. For Dr. Piette would have us place the conversion not in 1738, but in 1725: and he most astonishingly minimizes the significance of that strange warming of the heart at the meeting of the Society in Aldersgate Street at 8.45 p.m. on Wednesday, May 24, a hundred years ago. "The famous conversion, which has been called upon to play so prominent a part in the doctrinal life of the Methodism of the nineteenth century, enjoyed but a very modest rôle in the founder's life and in that of his companions. In fact . . . it

would seem to have been merely a quite ordinary experience whose effects time was quickly to dull. Had it not been entered in the first extract of the *Journal*, it is quite possible that Wesley would have entirely forgotten all about it" (p. 306). These extraordinary insinuations and conjectures have been ably controverted by Dr. J. Ernest Rattenbury in *The Conversion of the Wesleys: A Critical Study* (1937). It is true that it was in 1725 that Wesley "resolved to dedicate all his life to God": and this was the experience that Léger calls "*la conversion première*," as contrasted with the "*coup de grâce*" of 1738. But at the beginning of the latter year, after his return from Georgia, he was plainly longing to be "*converted*," and said so quite explicitly: nor is there any justification for refusing to regard what happened on May 24 as a true "Evangelical Conversion." It did not mean that he renounced his previous ecclesiastical practices and predilections, or that he was instantaneously transformed from a crabbed Ritualist into an Evangelical Methodist. But it did mean that a new spirit had taken possession of his soul. As Dr. Rattenbury says: "A man who had the form of godliness received its power. A zealous servant of God, to use his own words, became a son. A man who had failed to save himself by works and discipline trusted in Christ alone to save him. . . . Such a change is revolutionary: it is an entrance into a new world. And to this Methodists apply the term Evangelical Conversion" (*op. cit.*, p. 35). It is true that on p. 556 Dr. Piette inserts a note in which he defends himself against his critics and indeed forestalls certain of Dr. Rattenbury's criticisms: yet this exculpation seems merely to add to the confusion in which his interpretation of the "warming of the heart" is already sufficiently enveloped.

The third section of the book—John Wesley's Movement—is the most worth reading: indeed, no student can afford to ignore it. The two preceding sections are not really very satisfactory. It is always difficult for a foreigner—difficult even for a Janelle or for a Constant—truly to comprehend and accurately to depict the English scene. Dr. Piette is no exception to the rule. Despite his earnest labours and his extraordinary erudition, despite also certain brilliant flashes of insight, there are passages in his lightning sketches of English social and religious history which set an historian's teeth on edge. He does much better when he is batting on his own wicket. Of the Methodist Movement he treats with sympathy and skill. Yet, in his gallant attempt to portray the historic background from which Methodism emerged, he has blazed a trail which English historians should not disdain to follow and to improve.

It would be ungenerous to compile a list of the inaccuracies

with which his narrative is sprinkled: but one or two corrections ought, perhaps, to be placed on record. For example, the author, referring to the Restoration Monarchy, exclaims: " Not for nothing did the King bear the title of Supreme Head of the Church of England !" (p. 120). But in point of fact the King did not, and does not, bear that title. And it is pure hyperbole to say that " in the creed of Anglicanism " the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings " held first place," being regarded as *articulus stantis et cadentis Ecclesiæ*, comparable only to the doctrine of justification by faith alone in continental Protestantism (*ibid.*). Again, it is unfortunate that Dr. Piette should have repeated the ancient *canard* that Bishop Butler " when offered the primatial see of Canterbury . . . answered that it was ' too late for him to support a falling Church ' " (p. 139), since, as was conclusively demonstrated by Professor Norman Sykes in THEOLOGY (September, 1936), it is evident that Butler was never offered Canterbury at all. In justice to Dr. Piette, it must be said that he could hardly be expected to foresee the demolition of this venerable legend by Professor Sykes: but it is none the less unfortunate that he should have repeated it. Finally, an English translator might have saved him from being made to speak of " Corpus College " (p. 289), or to mention Leatherhead as if it were part of London (p. 392).

On the other hand, the impressive bibliography, covering eighteen closely printed pages without note or comment, will be of incalculable service to all who follow in the wake of Father Piette's elaborate researches: and he has given us a picture of the Methodist Movement which is vivid and sympathetic even if it is not, perhaps, always quite in focus.

CHARLES SMYTH.

NOTICES

DOMINICAN LIFE. By F. D. Joret, O.P. Sands and Co. 7s. 6d.

The Order of Preachers (O.P.), or Dominicans, has been described to English readers in many excellent works, which give the history of the Order, admirably documented, from archives, in which are stored and preserved the Acta of Chapters from the foundation of the Order 700 years ago. And now we are able to soar above the level of the historians, as the author expresses it (p. 119), in the most interesting book under review. It is written to guide and to inspire the members of the Third Order—*i.e.* Tertiaries; and if this purpose is kept in mind it is easier to overlook the spirit of competitive pride which sometimes shews itself.

The rule of the Third Order is expounded and the ideals explained with a lucidity and fervour which makes it most inspiring.

PAUL B. BULL, C.R.

THE MEDIÆVAL LATIN AND ROMANCE LYRIC TO A.D. 1300. By F. Brittain. Cambridge University Press. 15s.

This is a very beautiful book both in format and in contents, and anyone who is sufficiently interested in its subject to contemplate buying it may rest assured that, if he does so, he will never want to part with it. It is a work of scholarship which must be of great interest and value to students of European literature, but it will appeal no less to all who love beautiful poetry simply for its own sake. It is designed to illustrate the development of Western European poetry, religious and secular, from the fourth century to the close of the thirteenth, beginning with the *Te Deum* and ending with Dante. The poems are arranged in chronological order without regard to their language and thus provide an excellent conspectus of the development of the various poetical forms exemplified in them and their close mutual relations. The first part of the book consists of an introduction in which the history of early mediæval lyrical poetry is traced in a manner that is learned, concise and very informing. On the vernacular side the present reviewer is without qualifications to judge it, but so far as its treatment of Latin poetry is concerned he may perhaps presume to pay a humble tribute to its accuracy and worth. In the second part the poems chosen to illustrate the author's theme are printed textually, each being preceded by an introduction that contrives to convey a great deal of information in a brief space. The vernacular languages represented are Provençal, (North) French, Castilian, Galician-Portuguese and Italian. These may sound rather frightening to the lay reader, but anyone who has a fair acquaintance with Latin and modern French and Italian will find no great difficulty in making them out and so putting himself into a position to appreciate their gracious and spring-like charm.

C. S. PHILLIPS.

RELIGION IN SOCIAL ACTION. By Maurice B. Reckitt. 3s. 6d.

In this book Mr. Reckitt has given us a work of great weight and value out of all proportion to its size. It is well set up. We notice only one misprint—p. 124, line 7, "perpetrate" instead of "perpetuate"; and there is a sufficient index which readers will find a great help, for much of the

book requires to be read again and again. The author says that his book is complementary to Dr. Lofthouse's *Christianity in the Social State*, which should be read before this, for "he provides a foundation assumed in this book."

In the first chapter, on "Why the Church is Involved," he points out that the Church counts for little today, not "from a failure of heart, but a failure of understanding and will" (p. 11); and quotes a placard which proclaimed that the three established political parties failed because one didn't care, another didn't dare, and the third "wasn't there." So with different groups of Churchmen. He rightly insists that we must recognize that "the individual is constantly confronted by situations in which there is no absolutely right thing which he can do." The Church's function is not to deal with motives, "the spirit of forgiveness," a "new spirit in industry," etc., but to give a new direction to industry which will bring it into harmony with the will of God. "The Church transformed Europe in its early centuries because it was alive in a world that was dying, and it was alive because its Redeemer and its Hope was alive in the hearts and minds of its members. And in proportion as those out of whom the Church today is made are thus alive in every faculty, shall we see the Faith at work in social action" (p. 24).

Then follows a just and penetrating analysis of the fruits of secularist civilization, culminating in the Totalitarian State, which "is a return to the pagan conception of the collectivity embodied in the deified emperors of Rome." "The totalitarian states of today are the revenge of civilization for the failure of scepticism to give man courage, and the failure of the Faith to give him understanding." The author then deals with the problems of poverty, money, machinery and leisure, which are followed by two admirable chapters on "Christianity and the Next War" and "The Roots of War and the Duty of the Church," and a less satisfactory chapter on "Church Social Action." In the chapters on war he abandons the fatal fallacy of pacifists that there is no right use of force, and gives an analysis quite excellent in its sanity of judgment, which make these the strongest section of the book.

The book would have been strengthened by a chapter on "The Church and Usury," for until this subject is tackled we have not arrived on the battlefield. When, under the influence of Charles Gore the Pan-Anglican Conference denounced the present economic system as, on four points, definitely anti-Christian, the international moneylenders took not the slightest notice of them. But when Major Douglas published his scheme, the moneylenders mobilized their whole force against him, for he threatened usury. In a world governed by international moneylenders the one hope of deliverance centres on the destruction of usury, and we hope that Mr. Reckitt will give us his guidance on this subject in another book. For the failure of the Church to deal effectually with this sin is at the root of all its other failures.

The whole book under review is marked by a sanity of judgment and a fairness in stating problems which recalls the spirit of Charles Gore. Mr. Reckitt's devotion to the Faith, and his mastery of his subject, have given him prophetic insight, so that he is always dealing with the root causes of social evils, and is never deflected to superficial aspects. The book should be read by every earnest Christian, and it might be taken by our bishops as a basis for their deliberations at the next Pan-Anglican Conference.

PAUL B. BULL.

Aspects of Belief. By J. E. Bezzant, B.D. Nisbet. 7s. 6d.

A careful and thorough presentation of modern liberal Christianity for an American university audience. It contains much that is good, much that is unsatisfactory, and little that has not been said many times before. It provokes the enquiry as to whether there is any real need today for the type of apologetic which it embodies. For the question which the modern young man or woman wants to ask is not so much "Is it still possible to believe the Christian religion?" as "Has the Church any gospel for the chaos of the present day?" and it will require a much more positive and aggressive statement of the essentials of Christianity than Chancellor Bezzant's to answer it. E. L. Mascall.

The Gates of New Life. By James S. Stewart, B.D. T. and T. Clark. 7s. net.

This volume of sermons may be heartily recommended. The author has something to say and says it tersely, clearly, and forcibly. They are for the most part *individualist* sermons; that is, they treat of the relation of the individual soul to God. There is not much about the Church, and we should say that the sacramental side of religion makes no great appeal to the preacher. But within their limits they are first-rate. One entitled "A Modern Substitute for the Gospel," on the cult of humanism, puts cogently and succinctly what many preachers feel, but do not know how to express. The writer draws freely on literature, ancient and modern, to illustrate his points. In one sermon he quotes from Charles Wesley, Gibbon, Henry Drummond, Walt Whitman, Voltaire, Tennyson, Benjamin Jowett, St. Bernard of Morlaix, Luther and Frederic Myers. But the quotations do not appear to be overdone, and help to make the sermons as interesting as they are edifying. C. P. S. Clarke.

Spiritual Directions. By Cardinal Merry del Val. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. 6d.

The most interesting thing about this book is its authorship. We had grown so accustomed to look on Cardinal Merry del Val as the Papal Secretary of State and immersed in world affairs that it is a surprise to find him the author of a book of spiritual directions. It throws a new, new at least for the outsider, and amiable light on his character. The directions reflect a devout and pious mind, if they do not contain anything original or striking. To which the author might, perhaps, have replied that he had no intention of being original or striking.

C. P. S. Clarke.

The White Fathers in Africa. By Donald Attwater. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 2s. 6d.

This is the ideal missionary book. It wastes no words and confines itself to what the Christian reader wishes to know—namely, the facts about the propagation of the Faith, by this modern order, or rather congregation, founded by Cardinal Lavigerie in 1869. An admirer of

Livingstone, he worked for the suppression of the slave trade in Africa. The White Fathers were founded primarily for work amongst Mohammedans. This Lavigerie confined to that of secular education, believing that the time of conversion lay in the future. But amongst the heathen the Gospel spread like wildfire, more specially in Central Africa. The book is indeed a thrilling record of the triumphant march of the Christian Faith, springing from the blood of the martyrs of Uganda. The devoted lives of these missionaries, dedicated till death to the service of Africa, living like the natives, fostering an African clergy, and promoting an African culture, should stimulate the missions of our own communion to a rivalry in such noble work. Everyone who cares for the conversion of Africa should read this book.

H. E. Symonds, C.R.

The Jesuits. By Gætan Bernoville. Translated by Kathleen Balfe. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

This is a useful little volume written by an enthusiastic French admirer of the Society, who is by no means blind to the criticisms brought against it, and the defects of some of its leading figures. It is, however, slightly verbose and has a tantalizing way of whetting one's appetite for more precise information, which might have been given at the expense of some of the rhetoric. Most interesting to the outsider is the description of a visit to a Jesuit scholasticate which appears a model of industry and piety and common sense. Fresh light is thrown on the character of St. Ignatius and the nature of the exercises when it is shewn that the founder meant to leave full play for the spiritual and practical initiative of the member of that military company where obedience was exalted to the first of virtues.

H. E. Symonds, C.R.

History and Religion. By Archbishop Goodier. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

This book has distinctly disappointed us, for from its title we thought we were to have what we long for, and that is the conception so eminent a Jesuit as the author entertains of the relationship existing between history and religion. We found that instead of this subject he presented us with a set of essays which rove from Origen and his generation to Frédéric Ozanam and the founding of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul. We scanned his title with interest, and the title attests the wisdom of the Archbishop. For the wedding of history to theology is the wedding of one mortal with another mortal, while the wedding of history to religion is the wedding of a mortal to an immortal. Some of the author's judgments perplex us. We are told that few would read Macaulay or Froude, perhaps not even Gibbon, as historians, and we rubbed our eyes to see if we had read these words correctly. In spite of all that has been said against Macaulay and Froude, their work still lives, and it lives not merely because they were masters of language but also because they were masters of the sources of the period they investigated. The cardinal sin of Macaulay is the sin of not a few preachers and teachers, and this sin lies in the power he claimed to read the minds of the persons he portrayed, and to read their minds in spite of the absence of evidence.

Let anyone turn to Bury's edition of Gibbon and see what the editor thinks of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* It is still substantially true, though Gibbon lacked so much of the evidence that is available nowadays. The only real blot on the book is the insufficient attention Gibbon paid to Byzantine history, and herein Montesquieu led him astray. The Archbishop contrasts the prestige of Napoleon, the terror of Europe and the reconstructor of France, with that of John Vianney the peasant labourer, and the conclusion he draws is that today Napoleon's tomb is mainly a sight for tourists in Paris and the cottage of the Curé of Ars is a living inspiration for pilgrims throughout the world. But is this true ? We take leave to doubt it. It is easy to write down such a contrast, but how is the author to establish the truth of his contrast? Frankly, we do not know how he is to do it. R. H. Murray.

The Qur'an. Translated, with a critical re-arrangement of the Surahs. By R. Bell. Vol. I. T. and T. Clark. 12s. 6d.

All who are interested in Mohammedanism will welcome this able translation of twenty-four surahs of the Qur'an, and all who are interested in the question of higher criticism will also welcome it. Dr. Bell's book has developed out of his lectures on the origin of Islam, for these lectures drove him back on a critical examination of the sources. He sought to understand the sayings of Mohammed in their historical setting, and of course this was bound to take him behind the traditional interpretation given to them. He has, accordingly, consulted the standard commentaries, only to find that Mohammedan commentators differ quite as much as Christian commentators. There has been but slight textual emendation, for, like so many of the textual commentators of our day, he finds that the text can be accepted almost as it stands. There is indeed a surprising return to the positions of the textual commentators of a generation ago, and there are, for instance, many defenders of the essential unity of Homer. It certainly seems as if Dr. Bell has fallen under this influence. He assumes that the Qur'an was in written form when the redactors set to work, and he has been forced to take the position that Mohammed actually wrote his sacred book, though he is willing to allow that the prophet may in part have dictated it. The format of this volume is particularly calculated to enforce the conclusions of the translator. For the alterations, substitutions, and other derangements of the text have been indicated by the setting of the print on the page. This ingenious idea is, of course, the work of Dr. Bell, but we feel bound to congratulate him on the success with which his printers have carried out his conceptions. All who read this fine first volume will eagerly await its successor.

R. H. Murray.

The Political Aspect of Religious Development. By E. E. Thomas. John Heritage. 10s. 6d.

There is stuff in this book, but it suffers from the form in which it is presented. There are no footnotes, no bibliography, and the index leaves much to be desired. Dr. Thomas is a moral philosopher, equipped with an adequate philosophic outlook. Obviously he is not an historian, and yet an historian is demanded by the task to which he has set himself.

Even if he were an historian, it is obvious that he would succeed far better in his task if he confined himself to a definite period of history at home or abroad. As John Wesley took the whole world for his parish, so Dr. Thomas has taken all history for the unfolding of his theme, and we frankly doubt if he is adequate for such a formidable piece of work. At the same time his book is stimulating and suggestive, and this is much to say for any book, and we can say it of his. The chapters that commended themselves most to our judgment are those on such matters as the political source of Christianity, where the share of the Roman Empire is slightly sketched; the decay of religion in the modern world, which in effect means the decay of institutional religion, but not necessarily of religion itself; the appeal to history, where there is much food for thought; the structure of history; the values of history; and last of all, worship and the sense of history. We do not in the least mean to discourage readers of this book, for they will be obliged to think as they peruse it, and we do not for a single moment wish to discourage Dr. Thomas. At the same time we should like to persuade him to fix his attention upon a limited period in which, we feel assured, he is capable of teaching us much.

R. H. MURRAY.

THE THEORY OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN ENGLAND, 1603-39. By T. Lyon. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.

The Thirlwall Prize Essay has been abundantly justified in the past by the work of the men who have won this prize, and it is no less justified in the present by the notable piece of work which Mr. Lyon has submitted, and is now in the hands of the public. Mr. Jordan has lately covered precisely the same period with similar objects in view, and yet there is clear gain in reading both studies. The strength of this book is the careful consideration of the theory of toleration, while the strength of Mr. Jordan's is not only the consideration of this theory but its practice as well. It is obvious that the identification of Church and State long prevented England from arriving at any true theory of toleration, for even a man like Hooker identified the citizen with the churchman and the churchman with the citizen. With the prevailing view of the unity of churchman and citizen in one person, it was next to impossible for the theory of toleration to emerge. Emerge at last it did, and we are indebted to Mr. Lyon for his exposition of this emergence. We are left in some small doubt as to the degree to which he has taken Troeltsch's view on sect Christianity into account in all its bearings.

R. H. MURRAY.

A PREACHER'S NOTEBOOK: Outline sermons and illustrations. By Paul B. Bull. S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d.

These sermon notes should be of great help, even to the most experienced of preachers, for they are models of conciseness and lucidity, and they exhibit a characteristic which can only be acquired by long practice, that of arranging material in the most effective order. Many good sermons are spoilt because the "weight" is not rightly distributed. By a little rearrangement, an ineffective sermon can often be made into a telling discourse: a preacher of experience can take a paragraph here and a story there, and by inserting them at different points can make

the sermon a real structure while employing the same material, merely rearranging the order. Study of Father Bull's method should give the preacher an insight into the art which the same writer expounded in theory in his valuable work on "Preaching and Sermon Construction."

These Sermons do not strain at effect by the choice of arresting texts, nor do they make a parade of great learning, though obviously they are the fruit of wide reading, deep reflection and penetrating observation. The illustrations given in the Notes, which are rather awkwardly placed at the end of each section, are less valuable than the sermons, though full of interest to the reader. But they are too individual and personal to borrow: here and there a story can be quoted, but for the most part the incidents related sprang out of the preacher's own experience, and it is not given to everyone to travel so widely or to encounter so many interesting scenes and people.

It is customary to recommend such books as this to the young and inexperienced preacher. May we invert the habit, and recommend these notes particularly to the clergy of mature experience? They are often the worst offenders in the direction of narrowness of range, hackneyed illustration and slipshod arrangement. There is a story of a priest who was observed to kiss the MS. of his sermon as he put it away in a case after delivery. When asked by an observant ceremonialist what was the symbolism of this act, he replied: "I am saluting an old friend. I have now delivered this sermon fifty-seven times!" To such preachers, Father Bull's sermons would be like a fresh breeze of inspiration and their congregations would have cause for real gratitude.

M. DONAVAN.

HANDBUCH ZUM ALTEN TESTAMENT: JOB. By Gustav Hölscher. M. 4·20. JOSHUA. By Martin Noth. M. 5·80. Tübingen. J. C. R. Mohr.

Job is such a fascinating study in itself, and so much has been written about it in recent years by other than German hands, that no serious student will feel that a new German commentary on this book is superfluous. Timely also is this new commentary on Joshua; for in the last ten years or so archæological research has thrown a flood of light on the period which it purports to describe. An introduction (not too long), a translation based on an emended text, brief critical and grammatical notes, and an exposition of each section of the book—these are the features that we look for in HZAT, and these we find admirably done in volumes 10 and 11 of this valuable series.

S. L. BROWN.

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher